JAN 9 1931

Review

JANUARY, 1931

BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR C. COLE
VERNER W. CRANE
SIDNEY B. FAY

HENRY E. BOURNE
Managing Editor, 40 B Strobl, S. W., Washington, D. C.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* by Carl W. Blegen
Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Culture*, by Loren C. MacKinney
Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I., by Louise R. Loomis
Gras, *Economic and Social History of an English Village*, by N. Neilson
Bratianu, *Recherches sur le Commerce Génois*, by Eugene H. Byrne

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Strieder, *Aus Augsburger Notariatsarchiven*, by James Westfall Thompson
Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten*, IV., by George L. Burr
Hanotaux, *et al.*, *Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, I., by George M. Wrong
Rose, *et al*, eds., *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, VI., by Carl Wittke
Stevens, ed., *New Light on the Discovery of Australia*, by Andrew H. Abbott
Hinds, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, XXIX., XXX., by F. C. Hicks
Trevelyan, *Blenheim: England under Queen Anne*, by Violet Barbour
Hearnshaw, ed., *Social and Political Ideas of some Great Thinkers*, by Thomas Gottschalk

Phipps, *Armies of the First French Republic*, II., by Frederic L. Paxson
Griewank, ed., *Briefwechsel der Königin Luise*, by Guy Stanton Ford
Halévy, *Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, by F. W. Coker
Pomfret, *Struggle for Land in Ireland*, by James F. Kenney
New, *Lord Durham*, by Herbert C. Bell
Morrell, *British Colonial Policy*, by Howard Robinson
Meisner, ed., *Kaiser Friedrich III., Tagebücher*, by Ralph H. Lutz
Girard, *La Vie et les Souvenirs du Général Castelnau*, by Louis Martin Sears
Documents Diplomatiques Français, 1871–1914, I., II., by E. Malcolm Carroll
Lecanuet, *Les Signes Avant-Coureurs de la Séparation*, by Albert Guérard
Anderson, *The First Moroccan Crisis*, by O. J. Hale
Nicolson, *Portrait of a Diplomatist*, by Theodore Collier
Headlam-Morley, *Studies in Diplomatic History*, by J. L. Vincent
Goebel, *Deutsche Reichsgeschichte in Quellen und Darstellung*, by William Stearns Davis
Serpieri, *La Guerra e la Classi Rurali Italiane*, by Paul D. Evans

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Johnson and Malone, eds., *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV., by Allen Johnson
Morison, *Builders of the Bay Colony*, by V. W. Crane
Dunnan, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Slave Trade to America*, I., by Elizabeth Donnan
Pound and Day, *Johnson of the Mohawks*, and Seymour, *Sir William Johnson*, by Arthur C. Cole
Adams, *The Adams Family*, by J. F. Jameson
Hughes, *George Washington*, III., by John McAuley Palmer
Cosmas, ed., *Complete Journal of Townsend Harris*, by Tyler Dennett
Shaw, *Abraham Lincoln: a Cartoon History*, I., II., by Arthur C. Cole
Goodwin, *John Charles Frémont*, by Allan Nevins
Quaife, *The Kingdom of Saint Joseph*, by Louise Phelps Kellogg

(For Shorter Notices, see [illegible] Table of Contents)

Volume XXXVI] *January, 1931* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

PERSISTENT PROBLEMS OF CHURCH AND STATE[1]

EIGHTEEN years have now passed since the last Boston meeting of the American Historical Association, and it is peculiarly fitting that we should gather here at the close of this Tercentenary year to join our Massachusetts friends in celebrating the foundation of the old Bay Commonwealth. On such an occasion we might properly consider the various ways in which the record of these three hundred years has been presented by New Englanders and others. Much water has flowed under the bridge since Charles Francis Adams delivered his famous onslaught on the "filio-pietistic" school. The tendencies which he deplored are now less conspicuous, and the time is ripe for a fresh appraisal of New England's contribution to the national life. This task, however, I leave to more competent hands, confining myself to a single aspect of the record and taking that only as a point of departure.

I propose, then, first to recall the early Massachusetts experiment in church and state; and, secondly, to consider how far the issues involved have entered into the subsequent experience of the American people. Such a topic will doubtless suggest to most persons dusty treatises dealing with matters long since obsolete or obsolescent; but recent developments, like the evolution controversy in the schools and ecclesiastical partisanship in elections, suggest that perhaps, after all, certain ancient problems are not so comfortably settled as we supposed. If, in attempting to throw some light on these disturbing questions, the historian must hesitate to point a moral, he may at least help to place the movements of our time in more reasonable perspective. From this point of view, then, let us return to our Massachusetts pioneers.

The promoters of the old Puritan Commonwealth began with the conception of a Christian society whose interests were entrusted to distinct but coöperating agencies. In the words of the Cambridge Platform, church and state should "stand together . . . the one

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the American Historical Association at Boston, December 30, 1930.

being helpful unto the other, in their distinct and due administrations". The magistrate was bound to cherish "not only the quiet and peaceable life of the subject in matters of righteousness and honesty, but also in matters of godliness". To secure effective coöperation, membership in the body politic was limited to members of some approved church. This interlocking directorate achieved for a time these results: first, a Puritan monopoly of public worship which lasted for half a century; secondly, the maintenance of ministers by public taxation; thirdly, state enforcement of Sunday observance and church attendance; and finally, the ruthless suppression of dissent.

The peculiarity of this system was not the novelty of its underlying philosophy but the drastic thoroughness with which theory was translated into action. From the Protestant Revolution on to the Stuart Restoration, no one of the major ecclesiastical parties in England believed that the state could disclaim responsibility for the religious welfare of the community, however differently that interest might be conceived. The Anglican point of view is fairly stated in the posthumously edited and published eighth book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. It was "a gross error" to suppose that regal power was to serve "the good of the body and not of the soul"—"men's temporal peace", and not "their eternal safety". Kings were not ordained "only to fat men up like hogs and to see that they have their mast"; nor was Parliament "so merely temporal as if it might meddle with nothing but only leather and wool". The English Presbyterian Thomas Cartwright agreed with Calvin in asserting the responsibility of the state for the maintenance of public worship and the true faith. Hooker could also appeal to the learned Catholic apologist, Thomas Stapleton, in support of the same idea of a Christian commonwealth, to whose spiritual interests the state could not be indifferent. While defending the liberty of the Church against secular encroachment, Stapleton agreed that the state might properly defend the articles of religion and punish the teachers of "perverse things".

The practical application of these theories in royal orders, parliamentary statutes, and judicial proceedings is a familiar story. In the England of our pioneer generations public worship was the monopoly of a particular church whose forms were regulated by law; there were fines for absence from church, and publicly expressed divergence from the articles of religion was forbidden. Law could not, according to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, "make that to be truth which before was not"; but it might, "for public unity's sake, require men's professed assent, or prohibit contradiction to special articles". Nevertheless the terms of partnership between church

and state were not quite the same in Tudor England and Massachusetts Bay. In the old country, the ecclesiastical settlement was conceived largely in the interest of political unity and independence. The Massachusetts theocracy secured for its special interest a larger place among the objectives of the state. There is another significant difference. The Anglicans of that period still cherished, though with increasing difficulty, that ideal of an inclusive Church which was also a part of Catholic tradition. The trend of Puritan thinking, on the contrary, was toward the selective principle in church membership. The theory that church and commonwealth were "personally one society" did not therefore mean quite the same thing in England and in Massachusetts.

Before the Puritan experiment began in Massachusetts Bay, the foundations of the Anglican system had been laid in Virginia. The first representative assembly recognized the claims of the Church and this legislation was rounded out during the early years of the royal government. Governors were charged with the promotion of religion in accordance with the laws of England, and the assembly required conformity of clergy and laity alike. In Virginia, as in Massachusetts, Catholics were excluded and there was penal legislation against Puritans and Quakers. Statutes enforced church attendance, Sunday observance, and the payment of tithes to the clergy. "It is thought fitt", so runs a statute of 1629, "that all those that worke in the ground of what qualitie or condition soever, shall pay tithes to the ministers." No doubt the enforcement of some regulations was less drastic than in New England, but the researches of Mr. Bruce have shown that even the Sabbatarian legislation of Virginia was not a dead letter.

Not only in Virginia and New England was seventeenth century religion a matter of state concern. In Maryland, Lord Baltimore had a more complex problem. A Catholic by profession, he held his province under a charter requiring conformity to English ecclesiastical law, and aggressive Puritanism made his task still more difficult. In the colony, an active Catholic mission labored for the Indians and for immigrants who were partly Catholic and partly Protestant. From the outset Baltimore adopted a statesmanlike program of mutual tolerance, which in the stress of the Puritan Revolution and with the coöperation of the colonial assembly took form in the Toleration Act of 1649. There was no organic union of church and state; and Baltimore, though a son of the Church, defended his prerogatives as head of the state so vigorously that he was sharply criticized by the clergy. Nevertheless the Toleration Act itself recognized certain common elements in Catholic and Prot-

estant theology. Toleration was limited to Christians, and denial of the Trinity was made a capital offense. So, too, the Dutch in New Netherland, though comparatively liberal in practice, did not maintain a purely secular state. The Reformed Church was supported by the civil authority; and for a time the director and council prohibited other forms of public worship. Passing over minor New England variants from the Massachusetts system, and merely noting for the present the exceptional situation in Rhode Island, it remains generally true that the earliest colonial governments, whether English or Dutch, agreed in assuming some degree of responsibility for the religion of their people.

The Stuart Restoration brought new forces into play, which, taken as a whole, tended toward the secularization of the state—the natural reaction from the violent ecclesiastical controversies of the previous period; the secularizing tendency of scientists and philosophers; the rise of a more systematic economic imperialism. The course of the main stream was, indeed, disturbed by cross-currents, as in the early years of Charles II., when the rising tide of loyalty to throne and altar ran high. Notwithstanding the royal promise of "liberty to tender consciences", the new Act of Uniformity showed slight regard for Puritan scruples, and there were harsh penalties for those who remained outside the pale. Later in this reign ecclesiastical animosities found expression in the "Popish Plot" affair and the Exclusion Bill. Against such survivals of religious partisanship, however, must be set other and, on the whole, more important facts. The Catholic sympathies of the last two Stuarts and the Declarations of Indulgence weakened the traditional relations between church and king. The exclusion of the Puritan clergy from the national church ended the dream of a comprehensive Christian society in which church and state were only different aspects of the same community. Finally, merchants and statesmen were thinking less of religious issues than of regulations for increasing national wealth and knitting the realm with its dependencies into a self-sufficient economic whole.

These English developments naturally affected the colonies. The new proprietors, whatever their attitude toward uniformity at home, were less interested in extending that system oversea. By "reason of the remote distances of these places", so ran the Carolina charter, toleration would involve "no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this nation". So the proprietors promised in 1665 that no one should be molested or called in question "for any differences of opinion or practice in matters of religious concernment", who did not "actually disturbe the civill peace". Two of these proprietors adopted a similar policy in New Jersey; in both cases

they were governed by considerations of business interest, quite inconsistent with a rigid ecclesiastical policy. Notwithstanding the formal establishment of the Anglican church in the Carolinas, none of these proprietary governments of the Restoration set up the exclusive systems of early Virginia and New England.

The policy of the Crown, in effect if not in intention, worked in the same general direction. In the new charter of Rhode Island royal approval was given to an advanced program of toleration, with no preference for, or discrimination against, any religious group. Williams and his associates had developed a theory of complete separation between church and state, and now their "livelie experiment, that a most flourishing civill state may stand and best bee maintained . . . with a full libertie of religious concernements", could proceed, with the sanction of the Crown. The implications of this action should not be pressed; for the Church of England still received special consideration overseas as well as at home, and in royal governments that preference still had practical meaning. English officials hardly realized how far Williams had gone in his advocacy of the secularized state. When all is said, however, the Rhode Island charter marks an important stage in the evolution of an American philosophy of church and state.

Elsewhere in New England, British policy had a disintegrating influence on the older tradition. Whatever royal officials might think about establishment as a principle, they did not sympathize with the Puritan systems of Massachusetts and Connecticut. Imperial control under the last two Stuart kings was qualified after the Revolution of 1688; but the New England theocracy never recovered its old position. Dissent—whether Anglican, Quaker, or Baptist—secured a foothold, and a legal protection, which prepared the way for further advance in the next century.

The most familiar chapter in the church and state development of this period is Penn's "Holy Experiment". Rejecting all compulsion in matters of faith and every form of church establishment, he probably contributed more than any other one man toward the secularization of the American state. His personal outlook, however, was not that of the modern secularist. Approaching political problems in a religious spirit, he thought of liberty as the logical conclusion of Christian teaching; the state still had its religious function. The "Great Law" of 1682 required Sunday observance, not merely to give relief from "common toil and labour", but in order that, after "the example of the primitive Christians", men might "the better dispose themselves to read the Scriptures of truth at home" or attend public worship according to "their respective

persuasions". Finally, Penn's colony was a Christian commonwealth in the sense that participation in political affairs was the privilege of those who professed the Christian faith. Generally speaking, then, colonial theory and practice up to the English Revolution of 1688 took for granted some degree of governmental responsibility for the religious welfare of the community. On the other hand, the idea of using the civil authority to support the claims of a particular church was losing ground.

The adjustments which followed the Revolution open a new chapter. The English Toleration Act of 1689 was a practical, though illogical, compromise between churchmen who had asserted their special privileges against a Catholic king, and Protestant dissenters whose support was needed in a common cause. The concessions made to the latter were not generous; dissent was legitimized, but with irksome restrictions, while the establishment was buttressed by ecclesiastical tests for public office. Even these limited concessions were denied both to Catholics and to those radicals who could not accept the commonly recognized standards of orthodox Christianity. The exclusion of Catholics was, of course, determined largely by political considerations, it being assumed that allegiance to the papacy was incompatible with entire loyalty to the national state. The propriety of this exception to the general rule was elaborately argued by John Locke in his memorable *Letters Concerning Toleration*. While rejecting compulsion in matters of belief *per se*, he insisted that the claims of the papacy were inconsistent with the freedom of the state, a point of view not unlike that presented by certain opponents of Governor Smith.

These aspects of English opinion were reflected in colonial politics. Under the second Massachusetts charter, for instance, there was toleration of a kind not different in principle from that of the mother country. Here also Catholics were denied the equal protection of the law, and concessions to dissenters, including in this case members of the Anglican communion, were grudgingly made under the double pressure of growing minorities in the colony and of the home government. The Virginia Toleration Act of 1699 was on the general lines of the earlier English statute, while in Maryland and New York the overthrow of Catholic rulers was followed by severe legislation against the old faith. Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, though refraining from active persecution, each took a backward step in the next half century by denying to Catholics equality of political rights. Even in such comparatively liberal circles colonial opinion did not get beyond "an equal universal toleration of protestants", to quote the words of a New York historian.

The legal establishments which existed at the beginning of the eighteenth century were continued with varying effectiveness until the outbreak of the Revolution. Notwithstanding concessions to dissenters both in New England and the South, many grievances remained. Nevertheless, extra-legal developments were slowly undermining the old system. Of prime importance was the inflow of immigrants from Germany and Ireland, not so much into New England as to the southward. Some of them were Catholic but this immigration was discouraged by hostile legislation, both British and colonial. Protestants, however, of almost every conceivable variety came in. The established churches held their ground better in the older settlements, but in the back country it was quite another story. In the middle colonies, the heterogeneous character of the early population was intensified; and the South which began, like New England, with a tradition of solidarity gradually saw that solidarity disappearing.

Then came the Great Awakening, that extraordinary movement which, under the preaching of Edwards, Whitefield, and the Tennents, drew men toward a more personal and emotional religion than they found in most Anglican churches or Puritan meeting houses. Regarded with suspicion by the conservative clergy, the new spirit found expression in the separatist churches of New England and the "new side" Presbyterians of the middle colonies and the South; it furnished recruits also for the rising "popular churches" of the Baptists and the Methodists. None of these new dissenting groups had much strength among the influential classes; but their day was soon to come. Meantime, the colonial establishments had to face no less serious dangers from within. The "Parson's Cause" in Virginia illustrates the friction between Anglican clergy and laity. Both there and in New England, orthodoxy also suffered from the peaceful penetration of deism and secularism. The thoroughgoing convictions on which the old order rested were losing their influence.

So matters stood on the threshold of the Revolutionary era. In the political antagonisms of that period, religion had a minor, but not quite negligible, part. The fear of an American episcopate was exploited by Whig propagandists among New England Congregationalists and middle-state Presbyterians. Anti-Catholic feeling, intensified by a century of international conflict with Frenchmen and Spaniards, was invoked to discredit the Quebec Act of 1774, with its concessions to the Church in Canada. The outbreak of hostilities, however, brought a larger, or more realistic, outlook. With hopes of Canadian support, Congress no longer denounced the "Popish" tendencies of the British government; Washington

discouraged the observance of "Pope Day" in the Continental army; and a Catholic priest accompanied the American delegation to Canada. New associations with the Catholic governments of France and Spain had their influence also. More immediately recognized, however, was the need of uniting Americans in a common cause by further concessions to Protestant dissenters.

The movement toward complete religious liberty was carried most nearly to its logical conclusion in Virginia, where a variety of circumstances cleared the way. The establishment, though at first founded solidly on local sentiment, now suffered from its associations with the old monarchical order. Friction between clergy and laity, the grievances of Presbyterians and Baptists, the liberalism of Jefferson and Madison—all these influences converged in the two great measures of this period. The Bill of Rights, with Madison's amendment, established the principle of liberty—not merely toleration—and Jefferson's statute of 1785 practically completed the separation of church and state. Important as these measures were, they did not represent a consensus of American opinion. Even without detailed enumeration of constitutional and statutory provisions, it is easy to show how misleading it is to compare Revolutionary liberalism in its most advanced form with the less favorable aspects of present day opinion.

In New England, church and state relations were not fundamentally changed by the Revolution. The Massachusetts constitution declared that each man might worship according to his own conscience; but it also asserted the universal obligation, "publickly, and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being"; each community was expected to maintain "public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality". As in colonial times, persons who maintained other services than those of the majority church might have their share of church taxes applied to the support of such dissenting services; but minority sects were still subject to irritating regulations. Though all Christian denominations were said to be "equally under the protection of the law", one denomination was in effect given a privileged position. There was, on the other hand, definite discrimination against Catholics. Every governor, lieutenant governor, or member of the legislature must renounce the authority, ecclesiastical as well as civil, of any "foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State or Potentate", "within this Commonwealth". In short, the state was held to be distinctly religious, Christian, and Protestant.

The Massachusetts position was, in general, that of New England as a whole, outside of Rhode Island. Insurgent Vermont, the state of Ethan Allen, required members of its legislature to be

Protestants and expected every one to keep the Sabbath and support public worship. Even among the heterogeneous populations of the middle region the state was not altogether neutral in religion. New York now took a comparatively advanced position, promising "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference . . . to all mankind". Nevertheless, the leading member of the constitutional convention, John Jay, had the traditional colonial outlook on the Catholic Church, and the convention required every candidate for naturalization to abjure "every foreign king, prince, potentate and State in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil". Pennsylvania, founded by men who believed that all external authority must yield to the inner light, required its representatives to acknowledge the divine authority of the Old and New Testaments. In the South the Anglican church lost its legally privileged status, but outside of Virginia religion was still a state concern. Maryland conceded religious liberty to all Christians; but its constitution included religious tests and permitted taxation "for the support of the Christian religion". Protestantism was made a test for office in North Carolina; and South Carolina declared that "the Christian Protestant religion" was "the established religion of this state", specifying certain articles of religion necessary for the incorporation of any religious society. Generally speaking, then, the early state constitutions retained much of the older European tradition.

The language of the Federal Constitution was liberal so far as it went, excluding religious tests for Federal offices; and the first amendment forbade any Federal establishment of religion. These clauses did not, however, prevent state action in this field; and, in general, so far as the Federal government was concerned, the issue was largely academic.

Nevertheless progress had been made. At their worst, the discriminatory clauses of the constitutions could not have the vitality of similar phrases in earlier times. The Virginia statute, though exceptional, showed how the tide was running, and the optimism of some representative contemporaries was not unreasonable. Washington, for instance, was doubtless right when, in his response to a congratulatory address on his inauguration in 1789, he observed that "Christians of different denominations" were "more charitable toward each other than in any former age, or in any other nation". A few months earlier, William Samuel Johnson—conspicuous Anglican layman, Connecticut member of the Federal Convention, and first president of Columbia College—wrote in a similar vein to his

Congregational friend, President Stiles of Yale. Johnson emphasized the progress of religious toleration in his time and "in our enlightened Country", which in this respect had "now advanced certainly beyond any other nation upon earth".

During the first quarter century of the new Union cross-currents and backwaters tended to obscure the general drift. Federalism, in alliance with the New England "standing order", exploited religious conservatism against Jefferson and his "Jacobin" hosts. Meantime, however, Catholics and Protestants alike were demonstrating the possibility of effective organization without state aid, as "free churches in a free state". When, in 1818 and 1833, Connecticut and Massachusetts eliminated from their fundamental law the principle of discrimination for or against particular religious groups, the separation of church and state had become a shibboleth of American political philosophy. This separation, however, was, and still is, qualified by some public recognition of religion, in such matters as devotional exercises on public occasions, the provision of chaplains for the army and navy, and, more substantially, in the exemption of church property from taxation.

It was this situation which Tocqueville discussed in his *Democracy in America*. He was no undiscriminating admirer of American religious thought; but he believed that the American experiment had its lessons for contemporary Europe, then confronted by the advance of democratic ideas. Democracy must somehow be educated and the new order must be reconciled with the permanent interests of religion. In his own country, he saw religion suffering from alliances with the old political order, while the advocates of democracy and liberty were turning against religion. In the United States, on the contrary, no religious teaching, Protestant or Catholic, appeared to show "the slightest hostility to democratic and republican institutions". Tocqueville also emphasized the general agreement of Americans on the value of Christianity, and particularly Christian morality, to society and the state. Religion, through its separation from the state, escaped entangling alliances with changing political fashions and was strengthened within its legitimate sphere. In this respect, Europe had something to learn from America.

From this point of view, the trend of affairs in Europe in the next generation seemed encouraging. England retained its formal establishment; but religious tests for public office gradually disappeared, dissenters were released from compulsory church rates, and the Anglican church in Ireland was disestablished. In Continental countries, whether Protestant or Catholic, the tendency was toward the secularization of the state and equality of civic rights to members

of different communions. Notwithstanding the protests of the papacy against the overthrow of the old régime in Rome, Leo XIII. agreed with Tocqueville that the Church should not commit itself to any particular form of the political state.

To-day, however, nearly a century after Tocqueville published his commentary, the drift of things is not altogether clear. Issues long regarded by most Americans as comfortably dead, or dying, now seem very much alive. In England, for instance, Parliament has to consider seriously at least four distinct attitudes toward public education in its bearing on religion. Anglican, Catholic, dissenter, and secularist—each has his own reaction toward educational legislation. The right of Parliament, including every shade of Christian and non-Christian belief, to control the forms of worship in the Anglican communion is still asserted. Imperial relations have also their ecclesiastical aspects, as in the recent controversy between the British government and the Vatican about the affairs of Malta. Certainly no student of French politics in the past half century can neglect the religious factor, by no means eliminated by the formal separation of church and state. In Germany and elsewhere confessional affiliations still count in determining party alignments. The Fascist régime in Italy has decided convictions as to what is due to Caesar—convictions not always harmonious with those of the Church. Meantime the Vatican Treaty and Concordat of 1929 serve to illustrate the significant place occupied by the Church in our present international order.

Finally there is Soviet Russia. Its theory and practice present difficulties of interpretation; but the chief supporters of the present régime certainly concern themselves actively with ecclesiastical institutions. The orthodox Communist dogma was conveniently summed up by Karl Marx. The "people", he said, "can not be really happy until it has been deprived of illusory happiness by the abolition of religion." The enactments of the Soviet government indicate a similar view of religion in its historic institutions and processes. A church may not "own property" or enjoy corporate privileges as a "juridical person". "The teaching of religious belief to young children and persons under age in state or private educational establishments and schools" has been made a penal offense. All ministers of religion are disfranchised and officially stigmatized "as belonging to the class of exploiters". Though citizens are declared "free to profess any or no religion", here is obviously something quite different from the nineteenth century concept of "a free church in a free state". Nearly three hundred years ago, Milton complained that "New Presbyter is but Old Priest

writ large". So to-day one suspects that the twentieth century "ideologist" has more in common with the ecclesiastical partisans of the seventeenth century than he would care to admit. Like them he has his orthodoxies to protect and like them he leans heavily upon the compulsory power of the state.

In short, the simple optimism of American thinking a century ago needs qualification so far as contemporary Europe is concerned. May we then console ourselves with the reflection that the Old World is suffering from pathological conditions from which we, in our isolation, are happily free? This is a comfortable theory but the facts are less encouraging.

Figgis pointed out some years ago, in his admirable *Churches in the Modern State,* certain deeper issues which can not be disposed of by the simple formula of separation. Whatever may be the formal relations of church and state, religion and politics, with the corporate societies which represent these great human interests, will act in the same areas and claim the allegiance, in part at least, of the same people. In most countries we can no longer assume, like the medieval thinkers or even such Protestant apologists as Calvin and Hooker, a Christian commonwealth in which a single church may speak with undisputed authority for the whole community. Nevertheless, the individual who owes allegiance to a church also belongs to the body politic; between church and state, therefore, there are still possibilities of conflict and coöperation. To-day, as in the past, we may agree that Caesar should have his due and God the things that are God's, and yet find it difficult to apply the principle in relation to certain common interests, as for instance marriage or education. Whatever we may think about the distant future of religion, we can hardly foresee a time when the state may not have to face the stubborn insistence of individuals or churches that they must obey God rather than man. Must the state always have the last word, or should it concede to other societies an authority in some measure independent of its own? These are certainly not dead issues.

Let us consider, for instance, the common interest of church and state in education. In colonial New England, both worked together in setting up the educational system. The state assigned to the towns the duty of maintaining schools; but school and college were expected to serve the religious needs of a society substantially agreed upon the main tenets of Protestant Christianity. Even in the nineteenth century, the clergy exerted a considerable influence on school committees and simple religious exercises were considered a normal part of the school program. Presently, however, the situation was

radically changed by the new mass migration. In New England particularly, the old Puritan stock adjusted itself with difficulty to the very different outlook of the newcomers. It became impossible to find a formula of religious education which satisfied one group without implications objectionable to another. The controversy on this subject has passed through various phases—too many to be adequately dealt with here. It is worth while, however, to indicate the essential issues involved.

In brief, the thoroughgoing churchman—Catholic, Anglican, or Lutheran—conceives of education as an integral process preparing the individual for his place in a Christian society, with all its implications for this world and the next. The interest of the state in civic training is acknowledged, as in the recent encyclical of Pius XI.; but since no generally accepted formula of religious teaching is available for public schools in so complex a society as ours, it is thought desirable to maintain other schools in which this integration of religion with the whole educational process may be secured. A typical argument for the distinctive church school has been conveniently summarized by the Anglican writer, Lord Hugh Cecil: "To teach no religion as true while teaching much secular learning, is in fact to raise in the mind of the pupil a presumption against religion. To teach what may pass as the Christianity common to various religious bodies is to create a presumption against the distinctive teaching of the English and Roman Churches." On the other side stands the secular and nationalistic state which also desires to mold the ideas of youth, ideally in the interest of the whole community, actually, too often, for the maintenance of a system acceptable to more or less temporary majorities within the state. The two points of view are not always clearly defined; but each is upheld by powerful social forces, both in the Old World and the New.

One of the most important American debates on this aspect of church and state took place in New York City in the middle years of the nineteenth century. In the absence of a comprehensive school system, state grants for education were then administered in that city by a "Public School Society" which aimed to be "nonsectarian", but offered some religious instruction, said to be "exclusively general and scriptural in its character". From the Catholic point of view, however, this instruction was unsatisfactory and a discrimination against Catholic schools which received no such subsidy. The outcome of this discussion was the establishment of a distinctly secular and public system, which took over the work of the Society.

During this New York controversy, the Catholic theory was vigorously stated by Bishop John Hughes and his associates. They maintained, first, that the instruction given by the Society was in fact sectarian; and, secondly, that if instruction were wholly neutral, it would "exclude Christianity, and leave to the advantage of infidelity the tendencies which are given to the minds of youth". Catholic families, therefore, felt obliged to provide their own schools. This in turn involved "a second taxation, required not by the laws of the land, but the no less imperious demands of their conscience". One solution then proposed, and discussed from time to time since, is an arrangement like that now in effect in England, where so-called "voluntary schools" under religious auspices receive government grants, along with the public or "Board Schools". A well-known variant of this plan is that suggested by the late Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul; but neither that nor any other similar proposal has proved generally acceptable.

After three generations of controversy, the American public school has become more consistently secular, though practice still varies in this respect from one state or locality to another; but there has been also a large scale development of church schools for every stage of the educational system. From the standpoint of those who support the latter program, the grievances complained of in 1840 still continue: First, that the whole community is taxed to support a type of education antagonistic in effect, if not in intention, to the convictions of a considerable part of the community; secondly, that those who can not accept the state program are forced, in the language already quoted, to a "second taxation" required by the "imperious demands of their conscience".

Whatever the merits of the opposing positions, interest in the issue is not confined to any country or any particular communion. It would be easy to multiply illustrations of the practical difficulty, in view of the emotional factors involved, of maintaining a strictly secular education. Our recent anti-evolution agitation illustrates the belief of many people that a particular scientific hypothesis has been associated with anti-religious influences in the schools. However mistaken such an attitude may be, no serious student of history, or of contemporary European conditions, should find in it anything novel or surprising. It is, however, surprising that, with ignorance and fanaticism on one side of the debate, there was, on the other, almost no adequate discussion.

Nor can we ignore the possibility of intolerance on the part of the state. Discounting exaggerated accounts of the Russian situation, the policy of the Soviet authorities has certainly been to exclude the church from the educational field, and the educational program

of the dominant Communist group certainly includes the inculcation of a particular attitude toward traditional religion. If Americans are inclined to thank God that they are not as these benighted Europeans, they should recall the Oregon law of 1922, which not only made elementary education compulsory but, with a few carefully guarded exceptions, required such instruction to be given in state schools. The supporters of the law argued that the mingling of "all races and sects" in the public schools was a proper safeguard against "internal dissensions" and "foreign dangers". The decision of the United States Supreme Court (1925) annulling the Oregon statute, widely discussed here, was also brought to the attention of Europeans through a passage in the papal encyclical of December, 1929. With innumerable "pressure groups" demanding legislation for the promotion of their special views, the possibilities of state monopoly are obvious. It is also significant that the measure in question was defeated only by Federal intervention in a field generally reserved to the states.

In other forms, also, the influence of religious or ecclesiastical issues has been felt in our politics, long after the disestablishment of particular churches. Students of American history will hardly forget the nativistic movements of the 'thirties and 'forties, the Know-Nothings of the 'fifties, the A. P. A. of the 'eighties and 'nineties, the recent activities of the Ku Klux Klan, and the injection of the religious issue into the political contest of 1928. In all these movements we have to reckon partly with sheer ignorance and prejudice, which are not the monopoly of any party, religious or political; but also with real issues which have to be squarely faced.

To what extent adherence to particular cults may be inconsistent with loyalty to the state is a question which can only be touched here; but this problem also is not the exclusive concern of any one church. In 1928, it was discussed in the case of a Catholic candidate for the Presidency. This summer, the Lambeth conference of Anglican bishops, which included representative American churchmen, agreed that, after an international engagement for the pacific settlement of diplomatic issues, "the Christian church in every nation should refuse to countenance any war in regard to which the government of its own country has not declared its willingness to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration or conciliation". Again, the recent Supreme Court decision in the case of United States *vs.* Schwimmer, as interpreted by Justice Holmes in his dissenting opinion, would seem to imply that believers in the historic Quaker teaching about war would not be eligible for American citizenship. Other cases involving the same general issue are now pending. In the

background is the general issue, of interest to students of political theory, whether corporate bodies, religious or otherwise, can possess any authority not derived directly or indirectly from the political state.

Though we may draw theoretical distinctions between religious and political issues, it is harder to maintain such distinctions in practice. Questions of social welfare which are thought to have a religious significance are discussed from the pulpit and in formal pronouncements by church officials or assemblies. Among these topics are marriage and divorce; the liquor problem; the abolition or regulation of war; the justice of particular social arrangements, such as slavery or the present status of labor. On such matters churches have repeatedly expressed themselves from the beginnings of Christendom to the present time. Yet all these questions are also dealt with by the modern state and may become in that sense political issues. As a matter of fact, many men are governed in their attitude toward any given form of church intervention mainly by their personal opinions about the particular question discussed. If a man favors prohibition, or the abolition of war, or child labor legislation, he finds it hard to refuse help from any organized group. If, on the other hand, he happens not to like any or all of these things, he is impressed with the danger of "mixing religion with politics". Evidently, no simple formula has yet been devised which will hold in times of stress.

Within the necessary limits of this paper, it has been possible to suggest only a few aspects of a large subject. To those who believe that science is bringing in a new era, in which religion will have a steadily diminishing part, the present discussion may seem a profitless threshing of old straw. The historian, however, can not forget the fate of many similar predictions, the stubborn survival of ideas and attitudes whose disappearance has been confidently expected.

Meantime what conclusions can we draw from this survey of American experience? First of all, it would seem that we are not exempt from the clash of ideals which has troubled the theologians, philosophers, and politicians of Europe. Secondly, we may take just satisfaction in such measure of tolerance as has actually been achieved, rejecting a pessimism based on exaggerated ideas of what was accomplished by the "Fathers". Thirdly, it appears that neither the formal separation of the church from the state, nor any other simple formula, has permanently disposed of issues deeply rooted in human experience and human psychology. Finally, may we not agree that the perspective of history should help men, in this

as in other matters, to rise above the level of partisan and ephemeral controversy? With this longer perspective we can see better how important it is to enter into the states of mind, congenial or uncongenial, which are reflected in social institutions and movements. The desire to understand—this normal approach of the historian either to the past or to its reflection in contemporary life—is also the necessary condition of genuine tolerance, as distinguished from mere indifference. In the wider acceptance of this mode of approach lies our best hope of avoiding, or at least mitigating, the tragic errors of the past.

Columbia University. EVARTS B. GREENE.

THE EARL OF SALISBURY AND THE "COURT" PARTY IN PARLIAMENT, 1604–1610

WHEN Queen Elizabeth died in 1603, the true inheritor of her parliamentary ideals and traditions was not her successor upon the throne but rather her chief minister, Robert Cecil, later the first Earl of Salisbury. In the system by which Elizabeth had maintained her supremacy over the House of Commons, Cecil had been born and bred, and of it for many years he had been a part. By the end of the reign he had become her principal instrument in dealing with the House. In this rôle he was continued by King James and it was therefore upon his shoulders that there fell the task of continuing into the altered atmosphere of a new dynasty the Elizabethan system of parliamentary control. This task proved a difficult one. The aggressiveness of the Commons increased and at the same time circumstances combined to weaken the forces of the Crown. With Salisbury's attempt to control the first Parliament of James the present inquiry is concerned.

Elizabeth's supremacy was based largely upon two things, her own dominant personality and the use which she made of her ministers in the House. Of these the first was the more important. By playing upon the chivalry of her Parliaments, by able and flattering speeches, by her regal bearing and tactful management, she continued to gain from her Parliaments the measures and most of the subsidies she desired. Frequently she made concessions and allowed constitutional questions to go unsettled if only she won the practical point at issue. Occasionally she asserted her imperious authority and sent a command to the House which it could not but obey. But for the most part she avoided extreme measures and left the details of parliamentary management to the more invisible guidance of her ministers. In all her Parliaments there appeared, as members of the Lower House, a number of her most influential privy councilors. These men, clustered in a group close to the Speaker, formed a sort of ministerial bench and were, in fact, the leaders of the House. They initiated the most important pieces of legislation, they made clear the need for subsidies, and they formed a breakwater against the increasing demands of the Commons for more liberty in the House and for less autocratic methods of government in church and state. With the Speaker as their ally and a royal party at their backs built up by manipulation of elec-

tions, these councilors, though opposition was growing from strength to strength, maintained their position as long as Elizabeth lived.

Of this parliamentary system Cecil was the very incarnation. He had entered the House of Commons as a young man in 1586, but already as the representative of the government and the son whom his father Lord Burghley was training for high executive office. During his first sessions as a member of the House, he took little or no part in its deliberations.[1] But in the Parliament of 1592–1593 he became more prominent, as a member of that group of councilors who from the floor of the House did so much to control its policies. In this Parliament Cecil was no more important than other councilors. But in the last two Parliaments of Elizabeth's reign, those of 1597 and 1601, Cecil stood out as the chief representative of the Crown in the Commons and as the especial spokesman of the queen. In 1596 he had been appointed principal secretary of state, an office which carried with it the function of safeguarding royal interests in Parliament. He therefore entered the Stuart period as the minister most closely connected with the management of the House of Commons.

Yet with all his wisdom and judgment, his "infinite witt and policy", Salisbury was not a man to change with the changing times. His genius was Elizabethan and the ideals of Tudor government and administration were part of his very being. The House must be controlled that the state might be run as effectively as possible and with as little interference as might be from the misguided meddling of the Commons. Parliament was an unfortunate interruption to good government, unhappily necessitated by the financial needs of the Crown. In 1603, then, he began his task with his mind made up and his eyes fixed upon the past.

Salisbury, as the minister responsible to James for the passage of royal measures in Parliament, devoted much time and thought to careful preparations before each meeting of the Commons, a task which in Elizabethan times had been the care of the entire council but which after 1603 fell upon Salisbury alone. That Parliament might be called and dismissed at propitious times, he assumed responsibility for prorogations and adjournments. He advised and secured the prorogation of Parliament from October to November of 1605,[2] and in the autumn of 1610, with the king away

[1] D'Ewes mentions his name but once in the Parliament of 1586 and once in that of 1588–1589. Sir Simonds D'Ewes, *The Journals of all the Parliaments during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 404, 454.

[2] "Having fallen into consideration what causes are like to come in question this Parliament on the King's behalf, and with what mind it is like the House

at Royston, he was left with complete authority to adjourn the House whenever he saw fit. He carefully prepared public opinion by making concessions or redressing grievances before a session began. He urged the prorogation in 1605 that the people might gradually cease to fear certain royal commissions for raising money. In 1604 James wrote to Salisbury to "be earnest in trying and severe in punishing the thievish purveyors", and in 1610, "to sound and prevent all occasions of scandal or grudge that may trouble the Parliament and that before their meeting".[3] "*Yong Yelverton* hath made his Peace", wrote Chamberlain before the session of 1610, "and divers Gentlemen that were put out of the Commission of the Peace for being over busy the last Sessions are restored; and Sir *Henry Witherington* released from his confining or restraint."[4] Such concessions, to be sure, availed but little. Frequently, as Salisbury confessed concerning the reforms of purveyance in 1605, they were "but shadows and colors without substance".[5] And if they really did exist, they were trivial in comparison with the changes and reforms demanded by the Commons.

Before every session Salisbury made careful plans, not only of the measures which were to be introduced, but of the manner in which they were to be handled in the House.[6] Before the session of 1606, Salisbury wrote to the council that since they would be so fully occupied at the time when Parliament began and since the members of the opposition would "come with as many arguments

will come prepared, I have presumed to move his Majesty, wherein divers of my Lords have joined with me, to be pleased to give the same some prorogation." Cecil to the council, undated (spring of 1605), Hatfield House MSS. The same point is discussed in a letter from Ellesmere to Cecil, July 30, 1605, *ibid.*

Copies of the Hatfield House MSS. for the years 1603 to 1612 are in the Record Office where the author was kindly allowed to copy those which related to the sessions of 1606 and 1607. The other Hatfield House MSS. used in this paper were copied by Professor Wallace Notestein of Yale University, to whom the author is grateful for placing them at his disposal.

[3] Sir Thomas Lake to Salisbury, Nov. 23, 1610, Public Record Office, State Papers, Domestic, LVIII., no. 31. In March of 1607 Salisbury, not wishing to use the king's name, forced an adjournment upon the House by instructing the Speaker to exaggerate a slight illness and to remain away from Parliament for ten days, St. P., Dom., XXVI., no. 91. Cecil to the council, undated (spring of 1605); King James to Cecil, Oct. 7, 1604; King James to Salisbury, 1610, Hatfield House MSS.

[4] Sir John Chamberlain to Sir Ralph Winwood, Feb. 13, 1609–1610, Sir Ralph Winwood, *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I.*, III. 117.

[5] Cecil to the council, undated (spring of 1605), Hatfield House MSS.

[6] See similar plans drawn up and submitted to Salisbury by his servant Thomas Wilson and by Sir Francis Bacon, *Cal. St. P., Dom., 1603–1610*, p. 335; James Spedding, *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, IV. 55, 93.

as wit or will could furnish them", he thought it necessary that before the House met, "some such consultation might precede the general assembly as might prepare some good way to the mutual satisfaction both of the King and his subjects". Especially in the question of union with Scotland, Salisbury confessed, there were many small points upon which he felt himself too ignorant to debate without further study. He therefore urged that the council "might lay their heads together" to plan their campaign, that they might "second one another constantly without distraction".[7] Thus Salisbury planned the details of the battle with the Commons.

Interference in elections had clearly proved to be of importance to the Crown in Tudor Parliaments. This method of preparation was used effectively by Salisbury in the last two Parliaments of Elizabeth. Unfortunately there is very little evidence of any kind concerning the election of 1604. This must probably be taken to mean that there was less interference at this time than in earlier or, indeed, in later Parliaments. King James certainly made no move towards influencing elections, issuing instead a proclamation declaring that elections should be free. But why Salisbury left the elections to chance, as Bacon later accused him of doing, is extremely difficult to explain. Perhaps already affairs were crowding upon him and he was too occupied with other business. Or perhaps, with his customary assurance concerning Parliament, he was confident that with a new and still popular king upon the throne, Parliament could be easily managed. At any rate, it is quite clear that elections were neglected at this time.[8] And the popular party of opposition was returned with a very substantial majority which it never lost during the early Stuart period. The king and Salisbury soon saw their mistake as the temper of Parliament became more apparent. "The King", wrote the Venetian ambassador in 1605, "desires to order fresh elections in the case of certain turbulent spirits, who are little to his taste. He is well aware how much his neglect of the elections cost him last year." Although members once elected to the House could not be turned out, Salisbury attempted to remedy his initial

[7] Cecil to the council, undated (spring of 1605), Hatfield House MSS.

[8] Bacon to King James, Spedding, IV. 368. I find but one letter of Salisbury concerning this election. In writing, Dec. 23, 1603, to the Earl of Shrewsbury he asked that "you forget me not for a burgess-ship". Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, III. 83. On the other hand a certain Arthur Hall wrote the king that there had been packing in 1604 and declared, "I believe you will finde not fewe of them crepte in, by means of some, in great credit. and nere about your Majestie". St. P., Dom., VII., no. 82. But though the writer promised a long list of men corruptly returned, he could name but ten, of whom several should have been debarred merely because of technicalities, such as being sheriffs, etc.

error by a systematic interference in by-elections throughout the remainder of the Parliament. In a House undissolved for six years, numerous vacancies were bound to occur.[9] Before the second session in 1606, Salisbury made a very definite effort to place royal supporters in parliamentary vacancies, and the same is true of the session of 1610 and in a somewhat lesser degree of 1607.[10] On the whole, he was successful in these by-elections, occasionally receiving a refusal from a town corporation or local magnate, but much more frequently meeting with submissive acquiescence. The country as a whole was not yet aroused against the Stuart dynasty.

If a new attitude towards governmental interference in elections was beginning at this time, it showed itself in the House of Commons rather than in the country at large. In the famous case of Goodwin *vs.* Fortescue, an attempt of the government to remove Goodwin from the House on a technicality, the Commons stood firmly for their privilege of having election disputes decided in the House itself and not in the chancery. In this they gained a distinct victory. And in the next session of 1606, when the king asked that Fortescue be admitted to the House if elected from a new constituency and the Commons gave a somewhat reluctant consent, they decided that their resolution should not be recorded in the Journals since they did not wish to "receive burgesses by his Majesty's commendation".[11] Thus the attitude of the House was changing.

Interference in elections was designed, of course, to build up a royal party in the House and to weaken the party opposing the Crown. It is in the Parliaments of Elizabeth and James that there appeared for the first time the faint foreshadowings of later political parties. But in referring to early Stuart times, the word "party" is misleading. These were not parties in the modern sense, but merely ill-defined groups, without system or organization, bound together only by a common approval or disapproval of certain meas-

[9] *Cal. St. P., Venetian, 1603–1607*, p. 268. "It is observed that many Parliament Men of Mark are dead since the last Sessions. . . ." Chamberlain to Winwood, Oct. 12, 1605, Winwood, II. 141. Other vacancies were due to the appointment of members to governmental positions which debarred them from the House. The Parliamentary Diary of Robert Bowyer, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 208.

[10] Sir George Carew to the Earl of Salisbury, July 27, 1605; Ralph Sneyde to Salisbury, Aug. 9, 1605; Salisbury to the Mayor, etc. of Beer Alston, Oct. 30, 1605; Robert (Bennet) Bishop of Hereford to Salisbury, Aug. 9, 1605; Thomas Provis to Salisbury, Oct. 21, 1605; Sir Robert Cross to Salisbury, Oct. 24, 1605; Bailiff of Malden to Salisbury and Northampton, Oct. 26, 1605, Hatfield House MSS. *Cal. St. P., Dom., 1603–1610*, pp. 550, 551, 556, 558, 559, 566, 590, 618. Mayor and Burgesses of Portsmouth to Salisbury, Jan. 12, 1606–1607; Mayor and Burgesses of Kingston-upon-Hull to Salisbury, Mar. 12, 1606–1607, Hatfield House MSS.

[11] Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 108.

ures, and only gradually taking shape along the main dividing line of offering support or opposition to the majority of royal measures. The terms "Court" and "Country" were beginning to be used. Bacon spoke of "courtiers" in this first Stuart Parliament and wrote the king that of a certain matter "both court and country took knowledge". He added that Salisbury "had a kind of party in both houses". But the members of this group were seldom referred to definitely as the "Court". More frequently they were called the king's "counsellours and servants", or "his servants and well-wishers", or merely "the King's servants". At times they were referred to even more vaguely. In 1604 James spoke of his followers in the House as "the Parliament men".[12] Robert Bowyer, the diarist of 1606–1607, divided the House into those who "studied to please" and those who spoke and voted "out of conscience".[13] And in the same way, the members of the "Country" party were called "the popular party", "the populars", "the tribunes of the people", or "the patriots".[14] Party names as well as party lines were still shifting and indistinct.

It is essential to investigate the elements of which the "Court" party was composed. In the reign of Elizabeth the heart of the royal faction had been those members of the privy council who were also members of the House. Around these ministers the Court faction revolved. It might be supposed, therefore, that great care would have been had in 1604 to place among the Commons such a number of the council as would insure the continuance of Elizabethan conditions. Yet when Parliament met in 1604 there were but two councilors who were members of the House and Salisbury found himself suddenly deprived of what had been the very rock-bottom of Elizabethan control. This fact alone explains much of the history of James's first Parliament. The two councilors, Sir John Herbert, the second secretary of state, and Sir John Stanhope,

[12] Bacon to King James (summer of 1607), Spedding, III. 294. Bacon to King James, *ibid.*, IV. 368. King James to the privy council, Dec. 7, 1610, Hatfield House MSS. Lake to Salisbury, Nov. 23, 1610, St. P., Dom., LVIII., no. 31. *Commons Journals*, I. 197; Bacon to Salisbury, Mar. 22, 1605–1606, Spedding, III. 275. King James to Cecil, Oct. 7, 1604, Hatfield House MSS.

[13] Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, ff. 134–135. An "anonymous libel" directed against Salisbury in 1610 divided the House into three groups, "honest wise men", "crafty knaves", and "ignorant fools". The first group was composed of those who opposed Salisbury. The second group consisted of "all his friends and followers", while the third group was made up of those whom the knaves misled "by their witty and cunning speeches". ———— to Lord Haddington, Nov. 4, 1610, Hatfield House MSS.

[14] Spedding, IV. 367; St. P., Dom., XXI., no. 17; Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 115, 136; Buccleuch MSS., I. 102.

the king's vice chamberlain, could neither of them assume the leadership of the House which Salisbury had held in the last Parliaments of Elizabeth. Herbert displayed but very mediocre ability, and when the death of Salisbury in 1612 left vacant the office of principal secretary, no one dreamed of promoting Herbert, except, indeed, himself.[15] Stanhope was the more gifted of the two, but was not a great parliamentary leader. Yet throughout the session of 1604, these were the only councilors in the House. Such a situation gives new meaning to the case of Goodwin *vs.* Fortescue, in which, as Salisbury himself explained, since Fortescue was "an ancient Counsellor" who had been deprived of a seat in the Commons by the victory of Sir Francis Goodwin, "*the King's learned Councill and Judges*" met to see "*whether there were not some Means by the Laws to avoid it*".[16] This famous quarrel began, then, because the government wished to add another councilor to the small number already in the House of Commons.

Before the second session of James's first Parliament met in 1606, Stanhope had been raised to the peerage and Herbert was left as the sole representative of the council in the House. This extraordinary situation continued for a month, when, on February 20, Sir John Fortescue finally became a member of the Commons through a by-election. He rendered important service to the royal cause, but died in December of 1607. When the Commons met in 1610 for the fourth and fifth sessions of this long Parliament, Herbert was supported by two new councilors who now became members of the House, Sir Thomas Parry, chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and Sir Julius Caesar, chancellor of the exchequer. Caesar was a prominent figure in 1610 and throughout the sessions skillfully defended the financial demands of the Crown. Yet at the end of this important Parliament there were but three councilors in the Commons and but two at the beginning, while for a short period in 1606, the power of the council in the House rested solely upon the weak shoulders of Sir John Herbert. In comparison with the days of Elizabeth, the representation of the council in the House was at an extremely low ebb.

The government soon recognized its error. "For the King", wrote Chamberlain in 1612, is "given to understand that he is ill served in parliament by reason of the paucity of councillors and officers of household, that were wont to bear great sway in that House . . .". In urging a Parliament in 1613, Bacon advised the

[15] Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, June 11, 1612, Thomas Birch, *Court and Times of James I.*, ed. Robert F. Williams, I. 172.

[16] Cecil to Winwood, Apr. 12, 1604, Winwood, II. 18–19.

king to consider "whether it be fit to strengthen the lower house with any Councellors of estate . . .". And in 1606 Hoby wrote to Edmondes that the subsidy of that year was "propounded by Sir Thomas Ridgeway, and seconded by such like (for I must tell you, that I think the State scorneth to have any privy counsellors of any understanding in that House) . . .".[17] There was a decline in ability as well as in numerical strength. And the natural consequence was a decided lessening of the power of the Crown over the House. Real leadership was passing into the hands of the popular party.

An explanation is found by turning back to the Parliament of 1601. In that Parliament there were five councilors in the Commons: Herbert and Stanhope, who were elected again in 1604, Sir John Fortescue, who was defeated, and Sir William Knollys and Sir Robert Cecil, the leader of them all. Before Parliament met in 1604, both Knollys and Cecil had been elevated to the peerage. Thus began a process which throughout the reign of James was to drain the Commons of many of the most able supporters of the Crown. It was natural enough that James should ennoble those of his servants whom he wished to honor. But the number and the personnel of his creations undoubtedly removed from the Commons many of those councilors who were best able to serve him in that all-important chamber. The removal of Knollys and Cecil in 1604, of Stanhope in 1605, the elevation of Sir Edward Wotton, who might have entered the House in 1604, meant that there were literally no councilors left who were eligible for election to the Lower House had they wished to become members. The council consisted too exclusively of peers. Thus councilors were removed from the Commons and others to fill their places were not to be had.

Apart from the council itself, the king's party in the Commons consisted chiefly of two groups, courtiers and civil servants. The group of courtiers, men who held some honorary post about the king or were living on the royal bounty without holding any office at all, was the smaller of the two. There were of course men like Sir Roger Aston, a servant of His Majesty's Bed-Chamber, or Sir Edward Hoby, the holder of a patent for wool, who were distinctly courtiers and not civil servants. But it would appear that there were not so many bona fide courtiers in this first Stuart Parliament as there were in later ones. The majority of the "Court" party

[17] Sir Thomas Lake in writing to Salisbury in 1610 stated that James "had in the house three privy Councillors". Dec. 2, 1610, St. P., Dom., LVIII., no. 54. Chamberlain to Carleton, June 17, 1612, *Court and Times*, I. 176. Bacon to King James, Spedding, IV. 368. Sir Edward Hoby to Sir Thomas Edmondes, Mar. 7, 1605–1606, *Court and Times*, I. 59–60.

were men connected in some way with the government, either holding some office themselves or being the dependents of those who did. First of all in this group may be placed those legal advisers of the Crown who were in the House, of whom Bacon was the chief figure, striving to make his activities in the Commons a stepping-stone to advancement. Others of the king's "learned counsel", such as Sir John Fleming and Sir Herbert Hobart, were also important members of the royal faction. The rank and file of the king's servants, however, were men holding minor offices in the government: Sir George Carew, the queen's vice chamberlain, Mr. Hitcham, the queen's attorney, Sir Roger Wilbraham, master of the court of requests, Mr. Hesketh, attorney of the court of wards, Sir Robert Johnson, an officer of the ordnance, Sir Robert Mansell, a treasurer of the navy, Robert Bowyer, keeper of the rolls in the Tower. The list could be lengthened. These men helped in debate and even more in divisions. Other members were the direct dependents or private servants of great men: Thomas Wilson, the servant of Salisbury, Dudley Carleton, the secretary of the unfortunate Earl of Northumberland, Robert Bowyer, secretary to Lord Treasurer Dorset, and Sir Thomas Lake, who wrote many of the king's letters. Still others hoped for employment. And many appointments were made during these years from members of the House of Commons to posts in the government, at Court, in Ireland, and in foreign embassies. The number of country gentlemen in the "Court" party was not large. They were becoming too Puritan, too full of grievances and parliamentary privilege to take their places among the supporters of the Crown.

The king's party never had a majority in the House. And it was further weakened by a certain amount of disaffection within its own ranks. Bacon wrote that in James's first Parliament the courtiers and king's servants, instead of being "sure and zealous" in the royal cause as was their custom in the past, had turned "fearful or popular". The Earl of Shrewsbury in a letter to Edmondes in 1606 spoke of the House of Commons, "where yourself was wont to be placed amongst the mutineers . . .".[18] And in the same year Sir Henry Neville, who was at times thought of for secretary, wrote to Winwood, "This Parliament hath done me no good, where not only *Speeches* and *Actions*, but *Countenances*, and *Conversation with Men disliked, hath been observed. But in these Points I cannot betray my own Mind, speed as it will*". "As a Parliament man", wrote Sir Robert Johnson to Salisbury, "I was not the second that

[18] Bacon to King James, Spedding, IV. 367. Earl of Shrewsbury to Edmondes, Feb. 12, 1605–1606, *Court and Times*, I. 52.

excepted against the use of that Commission [for digging saltpetre]." [19] And it is evident from the diary of Robert Bowyer that though he felt himself "tied by special duty" to defend the proposals of the government, in sympathy he was strongly drawn toward the popular cause. It is not difficult to explain the revolt of certain members of the "Court" party. Besides the general causes of discontent, they had their special grievances. They were jealous of the Scots, who received so many marks of royal favor, and of Salisbury, who monopolized so many offices. They were becoming dissatisfied with the king. Sir John Stanhope, the vice chamberlain, for example, who was a privy councilor and a member of the Commons, seldom came to Court after James told him to his face that "he could not be quiet" till he had conferred his office upon a certain Scot. "Many such like Wrestlings there are with the old Servants, tho' most of them carry a certaine Shew of Contentment, and Conformity to the King's Pleasure." [20] Thus certain of the royal supporters were being alienated.

While the royal party was torn by dissension and weakened by its lack of leaders in the House, the popular party of opposition was continually growing in strength and effectiveness, until in 1610 it presented a united [21] and powerful majority which became the despair of Salisbury and the king. It possessed leaders and debaters who could hold their own with any comer, not only in the House but in the conference chamber as well. Of these Sir Edwin Sandys was easily the chief. His wisdom and moderation, his powers of debate and wide experience of affairs marked him as the most outstanding of all who opposed the king. He led the House in attacking purveyance in 1606, the union with Scotland in 1607, and impositions in 1610. Other able speakers were not lacking: Wingfield, Owen, Yelverton, Bond, Hyde, Brook. Some, such as Wentworth and Fuller, though powerful speakers, were too hot-headed to carry great weight. But though the opposition did not lack for able men, it possessed little or no organization at this time. Its leaders did not plan their campaign as they did later in the Parliaments of the 1620's. Opposition was still unpremeditated and individual, leadership spontaneous and unplanned. The party of the king in this respect still had the advantage, inheriting from the times of Elizabeth a certain

[19] Neville to Winwood, June 4, 1606, Winwood, II. 216. Sir Robert Johnson to Salisbury, Oct. 31, 1606, Hatfield House MSS. Other members were called upon to explain their speeches. Sir Maurice Berkley to the Lords of the Council, 1606; Sir R. Drury to Salisbury, Apr. 1, 1606, Hatfield House MSS.

[20] Samuel Calvert to Winwood, Apr. 6, 1605, Winwood, II. 57.

[21] Bacon spoke of the way in which the members of the House "combine and make parties in Parliament" at this time. Spedding, IV. 368.

organization among its leaders and a central authority in the Earl of Salisbury.

Of the king's supporters in the House, Salisbury was the party chief, commanding their forces and directing their efforts in the Commons. He did not merely outline the general policies of his party, but supervised with characteristic minuteness its daily acts and maneuvers. To command the king's party in this way, it was necessary for him to keep in the closest touch with every turn of events and every shade of opinion in the Commons. He accomplished this by demanding constant reports of its doings from his followers, especially from his servant Thomas Wilson. Wilson sent him daily reports written up after the House had adjourned and recounting events and speeches in considerable detail. Such reports supplied Salisbury not merely with a knowledge of events but with the principal arguments put forward in the House, so that he could answer his adversaries sentence for sentence and point for point. "The grounds of the arguments *pro* and *contra* I will provide in a breefe against the conference", wrote Wilson in December of 1606. And when his own memory failed him, he made the round of his friends, "to draw [them] to some particular recytall of some points"[22] for Salisbury's benefit. These reports, together with others from Sir Walter Cope, Speaker Phelips, and Sir Francis Bacon, enabled Salisbury to direct his party with a first-hand knowledge of what he was about.

With the situation in the Commons clearly before him, Salisbury issued commands to his subordinates, appointing to each the part he was to play in the House. He made great use of Sir Edward Phelips, the Speaker, a devoted servant of the Crown and a man of very unusual ability who carried out Salisbury's instructions with great skill. Phelips quietly directed members of the king's party to make appropriate motions at appropriate times. He pressed forward certain measures and delayed others, he cleverly obstructed the wishes of the House when they opposed those of the king, he even introduced legislation as other leaders became fewer. He worded questions in such a way that members hesitated to vote in the negative. In 1610 he appeared before the chamber with a message which he declared had come from the king but which was later shown to have come from Salisbury.[23] His letters

[22] Wilson to Salisbury, Dec. 4, 1606, St. P., Dom., XXIV., no. 13. Wilson to Salisbury, Mar. 15, 1606–1607, St. P., Dom., XXVI., no. 87.

[23] Sir Edward Phelips to Salisbury, Apr. 20, 1607, Hatfield House MSS. May 4, 1607, *C.J.*, I. 368; Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 277. Mar. 18, 1605–1606, Bowyer's Diary, *ibid.*, 4945, f. 136. May 11, 1610, *Parliamentary Debates in 1610* (Camden Society), p. 32.

are full of his hopes, his fears, his endeavors. Whenever crises arose in the House, Salisbury could comfort James with the thought that "the Speaker shall have his provisional directions". Perhaps even more than the Speaker, Salisbury made use of Sir Francis Bacon in Parliament, though consistently opposing his advancement outside the House. Bacon held a unique position in the Commons. Though counted as a "royalist", he did not exaggerate when he wrote the king in 1612 that he had never for one hour been out of credit with the Lower House. His position rested upon sheer ability and intellectual eminence. He was chosen to represent the Lower House before the king, and before the Lords at conferences; he made reports to the House, he served on numerous committees and spoke continually on all subjects. Salisbury made use of him in Parliament to draw up bills, to introduce legislation, and to push it through the Commons. In March of 1606, Bacon wrote Salisbury that on a certain day he planned to report the subsidy to the House. "But if", he added, "in regard of the King's servants' attendance [at Court], your Lordship conceive doubt the house will not be well filled that day, I humbly pray your Lordship I may receive your direction for the forebearing to enter into the matter that day. I doubt not the success, if those attend that should." And Bacon wrote to James in 1606 saying that in this Parliament he had faithfully carried out Salisbury's instructions "sometimes to put forward that which was good, sometimes to keep back that which was not so good . . . ".[24]

Other subordinates received Salisbury's instructions concerning the House. The attorney, Sir Henry Hobart, and the recorder of London, Sir Edward Montagu, were ordered to support the subsidy in March of 1606. "I was at the Parliament yesterday", Hobart wrote Salisbury on March 13, "and on Tuesday before the Recorder, and pressed the proceeding. . . . They put it off till to-morrow Morning: and I have instructed Mr. Recorder as well with my part, which is not great, as he is instructed in his own. But rather then the least offense should be taken, I will be there to-morrow morning and despatch my part. . . . It is hard if the backwardness of the House should be turned upon my blame, that was most desirous to discharge it. Direct what you please and I will follow it presently."[25] Earlier in 1604, Stanhope wrote Salisbury concerning

[24] Bacon to King James, May 31, 1612, Spedding, IV. 280. Bacon to Salisbury, Mar. 22, 1605–1606, Mar. 27, *ibid.*, III. 275, 277. Bacon to King James (summer of 1606), *ibid.*, III. 294.

[25] Bacon regarded Hobart as a very feeble parliamentarian, Spedding, IV. 381. Sir Henry Hobart to Salisbury, Mar. 13, 1605–1606, Hatfield House MSS.

a bill which the Crown desired the House to pass, "If you have thought of any principal motions to further the passage thereof, if you please to impart some of them, I doubt not but you shall see some good use made of them. . . . My Nephew Hollyer, and my brother Ridgeway will use their best endeavours, and Ridgeway, who is strong with his Devonshire crew, assureth me of a good party".[26] Thus Salisbury issued commands to his lieutenants.

Speaking generally, the government used the same methods in attempting to force its measures through the House as had been used in Elizabethan Parliaments. But since these methods did not meet with great success, the "Court" party sought new ways to win majorities. Between 1604 and 1610 there was a great increase in lobbying, of seeking privately to persuade men to vote for certain measures, of bringing pressure to bear through friends or officials in interviews outside the House. Near the end of the fall session of 1610, when the situation between the king and the Commons was very near the breaking point, a short prorogation was contemplated during which *"his Majestie's Party will deal every one with his Friend and Acquaintance of the House, to work them to some better Reason"*. In 1604 Stanhope wrote to Salisbury, "I have dealt with divers both yesterday and this day, giving them their reasons, as I thought might best prepare their voices and strengthen them to persuade others". Before the session of 1610 the king wrote Salisbury to take all possible measures that the Commons "might sit down as well prepared for good and purged of evil as might be", and when a vote on the subsidy was approaching in November, he was to "prepare men as well as he could". Bacon advised James that when he held his next Parliament, he should take thought concerning the popular party "for the severing of them, intimidating of them, or holding them in hopes, or the like, whereby they may be dissolved, or weakened, or won". Salisbury himself was lobbying when in 1610 he "had a private meeting . . . with a select number of the Lower House, in Hyde Park". In December of the same year, the king *"called thirty of the Parliament House before him at* Whitehall . . . *to ask of them some Questions"*.[27] This was an obvious attempt to browbeat members into abandoning their opposition and the news of it threw the House into an uproar. Lobbying did not

[26] Stanhope to Cecil (before Aug. 20, 1604), Hatfield House MSS.

[27] John More to Winwood, Dec. 1, 1610, Winwood, III. 235–236. Stanhope to Cecil (before Aug. 20, 1604), Hatfield House MSS. King James to Salisbury, 1610, *ibid.* Lake to Salisbury, Nov. 23, 1610, St. P., Dom., LVIII., no. 31. Bacon to James, Spedding, IV. 367. Carleton to Edmondes, July 13, 1610, *Court and Times*, I. 123.

meet with great success. Yet it is an interesting development of this first Stuart Parliament.[28]

The use which Salisbury made of conferences between the two Houses and the way in which these meetings were manipulated constitute another new method of attempted control over the Commons. Conferences were increasing with all other forms of parliamentary procedure and also with the more frequent occurrence of wide diversities of opinion between the Commons and the Lords. But they increased chiefly because Salisbury, now a peer, found himself shut off from addressing the Commons in their own House and was thus forced, if he wished to speak to at least some portion of the Lower Chamber, to summon them to meet the Lords in conference. In these conferences, Salisbury, nominally as a member of the committee from the Lords, but in reality as the chief minister of the Crown to whom was entrusted the management of Parliament, laid the needs and desires of the king before the Commons. He thus continued his Elizabethan rôle, though under some disadvantage, and argued and debated in the conference chamber very much as if he were still a member of the Lower House.

In thus addressing the Commons, Salisbury spoke with the skill of an old parliament man and with the ease of a graceful and natural eloquence. He was a brilliant extemporaneous speaker, "admirable to all men in eloquence upon the sodaine". Dudley Carleton wrote of a conference in 1610, to which Salisbury "came upon some disadvantage, because our men [the Commons] were prepared, but did so well acquit him self *ex re natâ*, and so clearly upon all the particularities of the contract, that he gave very extraordinary contentment". Even when demanding supply, "the Grounds and Strength of his Arguments" were "*energeticall*" and his speech "*persuasive*".[29] And to eloquence he added a moderation and a spirit of conciliation, very rare in James's councilors. Thus Salisbury made the most of his opportunities.

In conferences Salisbury, or other councilor-peers acting under his direction, invariably took the initiative. Frequently it was Salisbury himself who made the motion in the Lords suggesting that a conference be held. And when the conference took place and the Commons committee appeared, uncovered and standing, before the

[28] The Speaker also did lobbying. In 1606 he wrote Salisbury that before acting upon a matter which had come up in the House, he "sent to have conference with as manie as the shortness of the tyme would permitt". Feb. 14, 1605–1606, St. P., Dom., XVIII., no. 89.

[29] *Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, ed. Harold S. Scott, *Camden Misc.*, X., p. 106. Carleton to Edmondes, July 17, 1610, *Court and Times*, I. 129. John Beaulieu to William Trumbull, Feb. 23, 1609–1610, Winwood, III. 123.

seated Lords, it was Salisbury who explained the policies of the government or pointed out the difficulties in measures suggested by the Lower House. Perhaps he would urge the ever present subject of the king's financial needs. Or perhaps he was forced to check the Commons in their desire to legislate against purveyance and to say bluntly that "The King's Necessity could not admit, that this Bill should pass". Perhaps the Commons came armed with arguments against union with Scotland, and Salisbury, finding they were getting the best of the debate, brought the conference to an end. Or perhaps for once the two Houses were agreed in framing stricter laws against the Catholics. In all cases, Salisbury took the lead, as a prime minister might do to-day in defending government policy before an opposition party. He was, of course, supported by other councilors from the Lords committee. In a conference in 1606, for example, he was followed by the lord admiral, the lord treasurer, the Earl of Northampton, and Lord Knollys.[30] Such an array reminds one of the Commons in the days of Elizabeth. And, indeed, the government wished to duplicate that earlier time in bringing the force of a good part of the council to bear upon the members of the House of Commons. Dominated by Salisbury and the council, conferences ceased to be merely meetings of committees of both Houses to adjust disagreements or to arrange for joint action, but became meetings of the Commons with the chief ministers of the Crown, where the needs of the king were pressed forward with all the weight and influence which the Lords, the council, and the Crown itself could jointly summon.

In the sessions of 1610, Salisbury relied upon conferences more completely than ever. Realizing the grave necessity of a parliamentary grant, and maintaining a splendid confidence in his own powers of persuading the Commons, Salisbury took the whole burden of negotiation upon his own shoulders and conducted the entire campaign from the Lords.[31] The sessions became one long series of conferences. Between conferences the Commons debated the propositions of the Crown, and Salisbury, after reporting the latest conference to the Lords, hastened to the king to plan in secret what the next move should be. This, in turn, was related by Salisbury

[30] *Lords Journals*, II. 266, 550 *et passim*. Mar. 4, 1605–1606, *C.J.*, I. 277. Mar. 14, 1606–1607, Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 245. Feb. 20, 1605–1606, *C.J.*, I. 271.

[31] In discussing a Parliament in 1613, Bacon advised James "To consider whether it will be fit to steer the K's business as it was last time by conferences with the upper house, which will be hard to do now the Treasurer [Salisbury] is gone, who had a kind of party in both houses". Bacon to King James, Spedding. IV. 368.

to the Lords and was followed by further conferences with the Commons. The Lords as a House counted but little. Step by step Salisbury led on the negotiations till he had "brought all the great hounds to a perfect tune" and the Great Contract was agreed upon in the spring. When in the fall he saw his scheme come to nothing and all his labor wasted, he continued to urge, in fresh conferences, that the Commons grant supply in the ordinary way.

But even in this he failed. For the Commons in these years became profoundly distrustful of conferences. They saw clearly the alliance between the council and the Upper Chamber and were extremely fearful lest the committee members whom they sent to the Lords should acquiesce in proceedings of which the House as a whole would not approve.[32] Their chief weapon of defense was strictly to limit the authority of their representatives. Thus in a conference on April 5, 1606, the committees from the Commons were ordered to listen to the propositions of the Lords but "not proceed to any other Arguments or Answer, what Occasion soever moved in the Time of that Debate". In March of 1607 when a dispute over the naturalizing of the Scots had arisen between the two Houses, the committees from the Commons were instructed to declare in a conference that unless the Lords yielded they would give them an "Audience" but would do nothing more. The Lords committee "puttinge their heads together over the boarde" held a hasty consultation and then Salisbury closed up the conference, saying that the Lords would give "no such Conference as should beare the Title of an Audience, for there is much difference". The Commons were doing very much the same thing in 1610 when they did not allow their committees to debate in conferences but merely to deliver messages prepared by the House. As late as May, Salisbury complained in the Lords that "there hath not yet so much been gained of the Commons as to have a free Intercourse of Arguments, but only by Messages . . .". In the next conference Salisbury reproached the Commons for their suspicions. "The Upper House", he said, "trusteth their Committees better than the Lower House do theirs who had only to deliver a Message. . . . Out of jealousy you will empound us [the Lords] into a narrower room

[32] Fear of conferences was not a new thing. In the reign of Elizabeth, a certain Mr. Tate had written, "There is no one thing that hathe soe shaken the true libertie of the House as often Conferences, sometimes by withdrawinge the attendance of the best membres amonge us, sometimes by terrifieinge of mens opinions. I mean not that the Lordes doe terrifie men, butt men of the Common Howse cominge up amonge them at conference espie their inclinations, and knowinge that in the common Howse nothing is secrett, they gather other advertisements." Harleian MSS., 253, f. 35.

than is for the good of the realme. . . . The Upper House hath interest in the Commons of the realme as well as the Lower House. . . . The higher House hath dealt better with the lower House than the lower House with the higher."[33] Well might Salisbury complain, for the tactics of the Commons were practically nullifying his efforts to control their policies from the Lords.

The Commons showed their suspicions in other ways. Careful preparations were made for approaching conferences. To each committee member was assigned the topic upon which he was to speak in conference and it was understood that he should speak of nothing else. In many conferences, therefore, members did not debate freely, but delivered set speeches, which had frequently been rehearsed before the House. The Commons also grew more cautious about granting conferences on short notice. In 1606 the Commons asked for a conference on ecclesiastical grievances and the Lords replied on April 8 that they would confer that same afternoon. "This appointment", said Sir Robert Wingfield, "of so suddaine a tyme by the Lords did, he feared, not proceed from their allacrity to conferr, but it is rather to surprise us of a sudden."[34] And he therefore moved that the House debate the matter before the conference be granted. This fear and dislike of conferences was very rapidly broadening into a bitter antagonism against the entire Upper Chamber. The Commons resented the attitude of superiority assumed by the Lords and the close union of that body with the council and the king. They resented the way in which, especially in 1610, the Lords became the medium of communication between the king and themselves.[35] And they were justified in their suspicions. For the House of Lords, which later in the reign of James was to offer resistance to the king as did the Commons, was still in 1610 completely controlled by the Crown. James had made many creations and the cumulative effect of his affronts to the English peerage had not yet brought about its ultimate result. Salisbury, as the representative of the king, was supreme in the Lords until his death. He had a definite party in the Lords, he received a handful of proxies

[33] Apr. 5, 1606, *C.J.*, I. 166. Mar. 14, 1606–1607, Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 245. May 26, 1610, *L.J.*, II. 601. Collections (by Dudley Carleton) out of divers speeches at conferences of the two Houses, June (?), 1610, St. P., Dom., LV., no. 58.

[34] Apr. 8, 1606, Bowyer's Diary, Harleian MSS., 4945, f. 152.

[35] In an anonymous letter to James advising him to hold a Parliament in 1613, the author suggested that "his Majesty will be pleased to make his propositions unto the Commons by himself or by his Ministers and servants, that are of their own body and not by mediation of the Lords". July, 1613, St. P., Dom., LXXIV., no. 44.

at the beginning of every session, and by his assiduous attendance [36] and leadership in the work of the House, he gradually became the central figure of the entire chamber. But control of the Lords did not make matters easier in conference with the Commons.

This inquiry has been pursued too far without making mention of King James. For the personal traits of the ruler and his relations with Parliament, fundamental alike in this as in the preceding reign, were sufficient in themselves to determine the success or failure of ministers in dealing with the House. Unfortunately, Salisbury found himself handicapped at every turn by the peculiar character of his master. For though James was not without occasional flashes of political insight, he lacked the stability of character, the caution and temper necessary to guide the Commons at a most critical and delicate period of their history. His undignified and tactless bearing, his meddling and busybody ways, rapidly lowered the respect and reverence usually accorded to the Crown. He cheapened his speeches [37] by their frequency, their scolding and peevish tone, and their foolish references to the divine right of kings. His personal relations with the House were most unfortunate. Moreover, James handicapped Salisbury in other ways. He was devoted to the chase and spent long periods in the country, seeking relief from the hectic worries of the Court where he was confused by the diversity of counsel and harassed by the importunity of suitors.[38] But such absences interfered with business. "The Lords of the Council", wrote the Venetian ambassador in 1607, "have with great justice pointed out to his Majesty that his continued absence from the city, especially while the question of the Union is on, is very injurious to the negotiations." [39] A much greater stumblingblock to a proper understanding with Parliament was the extravagance of the king. James, as everybody knows, squandered large sums of money, partly by showering gifts upon his favorites, but much more by sheer waste

[36] The attendance lists in the *Lords Journals* indicate that he was present about two-thirds of the time, a remarkable record. In the sessions of 1610, he is reported present seventy-one times and absent forty-five times.

[37] Some of the king's messages to the Commons were written or at least corrected by Salisbury. But others were not. Over the king's speeches to Parliament Salisbury had much less control. For James when he got upon his feet said things which he had not intended.

[38] Calvert wrote in 1610 that the king was "*so distracted with variety of Opinions, from a Number about him, especially* Scotts, *that though he would, he cannot resolve that which he desires*; which is the Cause that as often as he can *he absents himself from the Town*, yet is quickly fetched again on every Occasion, which much troubles him". Calvert to Trumbull, June 10, 1610, Winwood, III. 182.

[39] *Cal. St. P., Venetian, 1603–1607*, p. 479. See also *ibid.*, p. 147.

due to a total lack of any personal supervision of expenditures. Such prodigality produced the worst possible effects upon the House of Commons. It forced Salisbury to be constantly on the defensive, forever explaining away new expenditures and excusing the generosity of the king. The Commons had no mind to fill "the bottomless pit of the Exchequer" that James might continue his extravagance which, bad as it was, became exaggerated in their eyes until what they imagined was worse than the reality. Extra-parliamentary methods of raising revenue piled up new grievances which were discussed as soon as Parliament met and which took precedence in debate over the consideration of further subsidies. In 1610 the government was forced to expose its extreme penury before the Commons which made them feel their power. And the spirit of bargaining introduced into debate by the Great Contract lowered the prestige of the Crown.[40] Financial difficulties rendered Salisbury's task next to impossible.

Upon Salisbury's shoulders lay the responsibility of managing the House. Yet he was constantly embarrassed by the interference and meddling of the king. James took a deep interest in Parliament, following day by day and even hour by hour the fortunes of measures he desired, and demanding long reports from Salisbury concerning the state of affairs in the House, the progress his wishes were making, the events at conferences, and, in short, every detail of parliamentary business. He complained of supposed omissions or contradictions in Salisbury's letters. And worst of all he constantly sent Salisbury explicit instructions as to what should be done in the House. In 1605 Salisbury was ordered to demand an immediate subsidy from the Commons rather than to allow them to grant a smaller annual supply. Again in 1604 he received the king's command to arrange that a certain law against the Catholics be brought up in a committee of the House. In more than one of his speeches in 1610, for which he has been so severely criticized, Salisbury appeared before Parliament having just returned from the king with instructions and commands. Thus Salisbury was not the master of the policies which he advocated before the Commons. Even in those policies, such as the Great Contract, which were peculiarly his own, he was not free from the interference and meddling of James, against which the council as a whole protested in 1608.[41] He was given responsibility without freedom of action and

[40] At least according to Bacon. Sir Francis Bacon to the king, Sept. 18, 1612, Spedding, IV. 313.

[41] Lake to Salisbury, May 4, 1606, Hatfield House MSS. Lord Dirleton to Salisbury, Feb. 10, 1605–1606, St. P., Dom., XVIII., no. 77. George Home to Lord Cecil, May 2, 1604, Hatfield House MSS. Lake to Salisbury, Oct. 21, 1608, St. P., Dom., XXXVII., no. 23.

was forced to meet and combat an aggressive and hostile House of Commons without being able to conduct his campaign as he would.

There were moments when Salisbury was supreme. James's feverish interest in Parliament was interspersed with periods of neglect; he was frequently away in the country or absorbed in some function or pleasure of the Court. And there were times when, with no apparent reason, Salisbury was left to direct affairs solely at his own discretion. In the fall of 1610, James, who was in the country, sent Salisbury a signed order to the Speaker to adjourn the House, which only required dating to become effective. Thus the adjournment or the continued sitting of the House was entirely in Salisbury's hands.[42] But such episodes came merely by chance, and with the return of the king to London or with his interest aroused once more, Salisbury would again be subject to his officious interference.

It was not in the nature of things that Salisbury should either demand or obtain from James that freedom of action which might perhaps have brought better results in the House of Commons. His influence over the king was great, much greater than that of any other member of the council, and certain of his contemporaries believed that it was complete. His power was so great, wrote the Venetian ambassador in 1607, "that he may truly be called the King". And the Spanish council believed that "'The King of *England* is *wholly governed by* Salisburie'".[43] But such was not the case. Salisbury was never more than the first servant of his royal master. And James though easily influenced was not to be controlled. His very weakness of character rendered this impossible; for he was easily offended and easily turned aside by the new counsel of every fresh adviser. Salisbury was keenly aware that his preëminent position depended upon the continued favor of the king, and he therefore played upon James's vanity, encouraged him to trust to his "little beagle" for money, frowned upon possible rivals, and when necessary bent to the royal will against his better judgment.[44] In 1612 Sir Walter Cope reminded the king that Salisbury had

[42] Lake to Salisbury, Nov. 23, 1610, St. P., Dom., LVIII., no. 31.

[43] *Cal. St. P., Venetian, 1603–1607*, p. 515. Sir Charles Cornwallis to Salisbury, Nov. or Dec., 1606, Winwood, II. 275.

[44] Salisbury to Lake, Nov. 27, 1609, St. P., Dom., XLIX., no. 62. James complained of Salisbury whenever things went wrong. At the end of the Parliament in 1610 he wrote, "Your greatest error hath been that ye ever expected to draw honey out of gall, being a little blinded with the self-love of your own counsel in holding together of the Parliament whereof all men were despaired as I have oft told you but yourself alone". James to Salisbury, Dec. 6, 1610, Hatfield House MSS.

learned two lessons under him, "as well to obey as to command; and to conclude with Seneca, '*Sapiens non se mutat, sed aptat*'".[45]

It must not be forgotten that in many things concerning Parliament, Salisbury and the king saw eye to eye. Neither understood the necessity of modifying in any way the Elizabethan settlement of church or state. Neither saw any reason for allowing Parliament more power in government or more freedom in conducting business within its own walls. Both considered it the duty of the Commons to vote money to the king merely because he asked for it. And both believed, though for different reasons, that these supplies could be secured without royal concessions.[46] It was in method rather than in principle that James and his chief minister differed.

The failure of Salisbury to control the House from 1603 to 1610[47] was more than the failure of a single minister. It was the failure of a system. Salisbury prepared for Parliament as in the reign of Elizabeth but nevertheless the royal faction remained in the minority and was divided against itself. The power of the privy council in the House shrank to pitiable weakness; Salisbury's attempts at lobbying and his use of conferences proved useless, and the king himself hindered rather than helped. The Elizabethan system, without Elizabeth, had broken down and was not to be restored. In attempting to maintain it Salisbury was drawing water in a sieve. He presents the tragic picture of a great statesman striving to continue outworn institutions and fighting desperately to maintain a political system which the majority of his fellow countrymen would no longer tolerate.

The University of Minnesota. DAVID HARRIS WILLSON.

[45] Sir Walter Cope, *An Apology for the late Lord Treasurer Sir Robert Cecill, Earl of Salisbury, Collectanea Curiosa*, I. 130.

[46] James complained to Salisbury in 1610 "that in his letters he had given him hope" of better results than were attained. Sir Thomas Lake to Salisbury, Apr. 30, 1610, Hatfield House MSS. More wrote Winwood that the difficulties of the sessions of 1610 were greatly affecting Salisbury's spirits "*because (as some suppose) his Lordship may have given the King hope of some real Assistance to be granted, without any great materiall Retribution from his Majesty's part*". Dec. 1, 1610, Winwood, III. 235.

[47] Salisbury wrote the king, "I have seen this Parliament at an end, whereof the many vexations have so overtaken one another, as I know not to what to resemble them so well as to the plagues of Job". Salisbury to Lake, Dec. 9, 1610, Hatfield House MSS.

BARÈRE IN THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY[1]

Two crowded years sufficed to rescue Barère from the ranks of ambitious but comparatively unknown provincial lawyers, and to elevate him to a position of national prominence. Thirty-five years old in 1789, he came to Paris to take his place as one of the two deputies of the third estate of Bigorre to the States-General. The legal world of Toulouse knew him well as a brilliant and successful barrister—an impressive and resourceful advocate, a self-conscious humanitarian, who avowed that severity was so alien to his sensitive nature that he voluntarily renounced a magistracy at Tarbes rather than impose prison sentences upon the guilty.[2] The regional literary academies were also acquainted with the handsome young Gascon whose persistent literary endeavors, pompous, trite, and wholly unoriginal as they were, finally won him the honor of election to membership.[3] The various essays that he composed in the decade before the Revolution give the measure of his political views: they reveal him as a tardy convert (after 1785) to the prevailing revolutionary spirit. His political philosophy was a Joseph's coat of many colors; the *philosophes*, the *économistes*, the classical authors, and the *frondeurs parlementaires*, each group contributed a distinct patch. Without actual political experience, he was not without some knowledge of parliamentary procedure, thanks to the training that he received as a prominent member of the legis-

[1] The author acknowledges his indebtedness to the Social Science Research Council, a fellowship from which made this study possible.

[2] Barère, *Mémoires*, I. 208–231. Robert Launay, *Barère de Vieuzac*, p. 11, makes the pertinent and malicious observation that while Barère renounced the duties of the magistracy that his father bought him, he continued until the Revolution to receive the emoluments of his office.

[3] *Cf. ibid.*, and an unpublished letter in my possession from the curator of the archives of the Academy of Floral Games at Toulouse. In 1781, he competed unsuccessfully for the literary prize of the Academy of Floral Games, but his essay, *L'Éloge de Louis XII.*, was published the following year. In 1784, he was elected a member of the Academy of Montauban, which crowned three of his essays—*L'Éloge de Le Franc de Pompignan*, *L'Éloge du Cardinal d'Amboise*, and *L'Éloge du Chancelier Séguier*. In 1786, he failed a second time in the literary competition of the Academy of Floral Games and his essay on J. J. Rousseau was rejected. In 1787, his revised *L'Éloge de J. J. Rousseau* received third prize and was printed in the *Recueil de l'Académie des Jeux Floraux*. That same year, 1787, he presented a new essay, *L'Éloge de Montesquieu*, to the Academy of Bordeaux. In 1788, he was proposed for membership in the Academy of Floral Games at Toulouse and finally elected as a *mainteneur*.

lative committee of a Masonic lodge at Toulouse.[4] There is no doubt that his affiliation with the Freemasons aided him materially in making his way at Paris.[5] These relations apart, Barère was unknown in Paris on his arrival. Two years later, in 1791, his name stood high on the list of political celebrities.

Several superficial reasons present themselves immediately as explanations of his political success, reasons so superficial and obvious that many of his contemporaries accepted them. His personality was exceptionally pleasing. He was tall, his features fine and delicate, his hair long and wavy, his voice rich and sonorous. There was a certain physical charm and freshness about his person that attracted favorable attention.[6] A critical bluestocking wrote in almost lyrical appreciation of "his delicacy and refinement", "his gentle and refined manners", "his provocative wit".[7] Better still, he was ambitious and industrious, possessing a keen flair for publicity and gifted with a political talent which made him appear all things to all men. In an incredibly short time Barère established a network of political and social relations that brought him into touch with the most influential groups and the most prominent leaders of opinion. In the Constituent Assembly and outside of it, Barère was forever occupied and infinitely at his ease under the most varied or trying circumstances. Yet neither the charm of his person nor the uncounted contacts that he had with all shades of opinion satisfactorily explain his emergence from the mass of deputies.[8]

If explanations at all, these multitudinous activities of Barère are at most secondary factors of his political success. Primarily, they are the seal of a certain conviction without which they would have been blind and meaningless. A more fundamental explanation probes the core of his thinking, without losing itself in the peripheral

[4] Launay, pp. 17, 30. Barère belonged to the *Encyclopédique* section.

[5] *Cf.* Gaston Martin, *La Franc-Maçonnerie Française*, for the extensive ramifications of the Masonic movement. *Cf.* also Philippe Sagnac, *Histoire de France Contemporaine*, ed. Lavisse, I. 230.

[6] A. Aulard, *Les Orateurs de la Constituante* (Barère).

[7] Madame de Genlis, quoted in Barère, *Mémoires*, I. 38.

[8] We may itemize his activities and affiliations under the following topical headings: as founder of *Le Point du Jour*, which he edited during the entire course of the Constituent Assembly; as a deputy in the Constituent Assembly, where he served on three committees and made many speeches from the floor; a welcome and invited guest at many social gatherings in Paris; and member, at different times, of several political clubs—the Jacobin Club, the *Cercle Social*, the *Société de 1789*, and the Feuillants. Carnot, Notice Historique sur Barère in Barère, *Mémoires*, I. 40. See also *ibid.*, I. 273, 280, 290 ff., 303 ff., 315; E. and J. Goncourt, *La Société Française pendant la Révolution*, p. 12; Sagnac, I. 230, 293. Launay, pt. 1, ch. IV., discusses this matter from a hostile point of view.

manifestation of his actions. By what he thought and voiced Barère coupled his name with *La Révolution*, with each new phase of the movement to make real and concrete the idealism that inspired the great majority of the deputies of the National Assembly. On the eve of 1789, his republicanism was ill-defined and vaguely formulated; from 1789 to 1791, experience taught him, as it did many others, to make it articulate. By his unswerving loyalty to revolutionary ideals—to the doctrines of popular sovereignty and to the credo of patriotic nationalism—Barère at once achieved maturity and gained prestige. But his loyalty to a central doctrine did not betray him into violent exaggeration. He was neither an embittered fanatic nor a romantic crusader. He believed in the revolutionary gospel, but he also believed in himself. The Revolution was more than a faith to him; it was a career. And if we bear in mind that Barère always sought—and almost invariably succeeded—to keep himself in power, we shall be in a position to understand how he so frequently shifted his front without ever changing his position.

Contemporary accounts are silent and Barère himself recorded little more about his first weeks in Paris in 1789 than the significant observation that apart from listening to the debates he sought every available means of becoming acquainted with Mirabeau and Bailly, two of the outstanding deputies of the States-General.[9] On June 12, the deputies of the third estate verified the credentials of "M. Barrère (*sic*) de Vieuzac", and on the 17th, encouraged by his new and powerful friends to share in the debates, Barère made his political début by proposing that the deputies of the third estate call themselves "the representatives of the great majority of Frenchmen in the National Assembly", reminding his colleagues that they "were to establish and not to maintain a constitution". He took the Tennis Court Oath on the 20th, and David's later commemorative painting of that famous scene in which Barère is shown taking notes of the proceedings for his newspaper undoubtedly added to the latter's prestige. The dramatic royal session of June 23, which Mirabeau's courage has made immortal, encouraged Barère to reflections on the moral lesson of resisting tyranny, while the concentration of royal troops between Paris and Versailles on the 29th and 30th animated him to protest vigorously against such an intimidation of "the great,

[9] Barère, I. 245–246. "My youth and my admiration for their talent", he wrote, "were my only claims to their attention"; but it is safe to assume that his Masonic affiliation had something to do with the ease and rapidity with which he gained the attention of those two prominent Freemasons. *Cf.* Bourdette, *Notice des Seigneurs de Biéouzac*, pp. 175–176, for the details of his election to the States-General and his work in drawing up the definitive cahier of the third estate of Bigorre.

representative body of the nation". The national temper was rising rapidly in those warm summer days, as the buoyant Barère foresaw a "free and enlightened France" replacing the "fatal variety of local customs and isolated administrations which would keep this vast and great kingdom a bizarre mixture of Gothic laws, feudal tyranny, constitutional weaknesses and ancient abuses". His prestige too was rising, for twice within the same week, on July 8 and on July 15, he was appointed to serve on delegations that the National Assembly sent out from its midst, the first time to Louis XVI. in protest against his use of troops, and the second time to the seething capital to restore quiet. As might have been expected of one who frowned on the conception of the National Assembly as a union of deputies from "each little corporative group or separate class that composed it", he voted against the *mandat impératif*, for, to bind a deputy irrevocably by the instructions of his electors, reasoned Barère, was tantamount to enforcing a permanent veto against the National Assembly.[10]

As disquieting news came from the provinces and events in Paris and the assembly grew more turbulent Barère learned to temper his opinion and to bide his opportunity. Not at all unaware of the calculated interest which in part inspired the stirring sacrifices of August 4,[11] he kept his peace, writing nothing more revealing than an editorial comparison of Louis XI.'s "ferocious policy" and the influence of philosophy in destroying the "odious and tyrannical servitude" of feudalism. Disregarding his personal information concerning the motives of the great nobles who renounced their feudal titles and claims, he struck a scrupulously patriotic attitude and wrote a laudatory paragraph on those nobles who lay down their fortune "on the altar of la patrie".[12] But on the peasant uprisings in the provinces he kept a discreet silence.

The same restraint, the same sense of uncertainty of the right tone to strike, characterized the exceedingly slight part that he took in the debates on the Declaration of Rights and the royal veto. It is reasonable to suppose either that he lacked the courage or else had the good sense not to take the floor against such redoubtable and renowned reputations as Mirabeau, Mounier, and Barnave. Yet in

[10] *Point du Jour*, nos. 1, 7, 11, 12, 14, 18 (session of July 7), pp. 13–132, nos. 23, 25, 26.

[11] *Cf.* Barère, I. 268–270, for his conversation with Talleyrand, De Noailles, D'Aiguillon, and Alexandre Lameth. "Il faut, me dirent-ils, que ce soient des nobles qui proposent la destruction des droits féodaux, et que des parlementaires proposent d'abolir la vénalité des offices; voilà qui réussira mieux."

[12] *Point du Jour*, no. 44. *Cf.* Bourdette, p. 190, for his letter of August 8, in which he wrote to his erstwhile tenants renouncing all his feudal rights.

those summer months of August and September, 1789, he learned the practical lessons of politics very rapidly; when the split between the 'moderates' and the 'patriots' occurred, Barère, who had already joined the Breton Club at Versailles, took sides with the latter and gained favor with his fellow Jacobins.[13] His first stand on the Declaration of Rights was ambiguous, but in measure as he veered more and more towards the left, he assumed a radical tone that marked his acceptance of Sieyès's theory concerning the constituent rights of the deputies to remold the state. The refusal of the king to sanction the declaration and with it the first articles of the constitution, early in October, settled Barère's hesitation. Not only was the king's sanction not required, he decided, but since the monarchy existed by virtue of the constitution, the monarch did not have the right to refuse his sanction or even to criticize the articles of the constitution.[14] Accordingly, when Louis XVI. yielded, accepting both the Declaration of Rights and the suspensive veto, which Barère had also advocated, the latter's services to the true cause of liberty were rewarded in yet another appointment to a delegation of deputies that waited on the king. Before long the assembly was to elect him secretary for a fortnight, showing that careers were open to talents and to careerists. These wisps and fragments of the parliamentary record are sufficient evidence of Barère's political acumen. By serving loyally in the ranks while the struggle was on to win the essential charters of the Revolution, Barère placed himself in line for promotion to posts of higher responsibility and renown.

The opportunity came when the assembly moved to Paris and settled down to the arduous and nerve shattering task of reconstructing the institutions of France. His share in the reforms of the assembly can be determined with reasonable accuracy from the contemporary records. From the beginning he took his place with the extreme left—with Robespierre, Pétion, Abbé Grégoire—though his name was so little known that the journalists paid scant attention to him. Outside of the assembly he was assiduous in his attendance upon the Duke of Orleans, of whose natural daughter, Pamela, he was the legal guardian. Not a few historians have yielded to an easy temptation, the temptation to dramatize events, and have made Orleans responsible for Barère's alignment with the extreme left;[15]

[13] A. Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins*, I. 407.

[14] *Point du Jour*, nos. 41, 52, 57; *Arch. Parl.*, IX. 344–345 (Oct. 5); A. Mathiez, La Révolution Française et la Théorie de la Dictature, *Revue Historique*, July, 1929, pp. 304–315.

[15] *Cf.* Launay, pp. 48–54. M. Launay repeats the stock charges of corruption that Michelet and Macaulay raised in this connection. While not subscribing to

but it is entirely possible to explain his position by natural causation without having recourse to Orleans as a *deus ex machina.* Barère paid court to Orleans, because the latter was the foremost Freemason of France, one of the richest landowners, and the most likely person to become regent should anything untoward occur to Louis XVI. Opportunist that he was, Barère was of no mind to overlook the remotest chance of advancing himself, and close relations with the Orleans clique were on occasion desirable in order to promote his advancement particularly when such relations were in keeping with Barère's own inclinations.

In the winning of civil equality for Protestants and Jews, Barère was indirectly concerned, though his rôle was so unimportant that any general account of that victory might easily omit all mention of his name. His journal carried editorial commendation of the restoration of full political rights to the Protestants as well as on the election of Rabaut Saint-Étienne, a Protestant minister, to the presidency of the Constituent Assembly.[16] He served on the committee on domains and reported its plans for the restitution of the unsold and confiscated estates of the Protestants of the realm, not losing the opportunity in presenting his report to make many gratuitous observations on tolerance *à la Jean Jacques.*[17] In his attitude towards the Jews, Barère probably reflected the large humanitarian spirit of Mirabeau, whom he greatly admired and who had done much to direct liberal attention to their status. In the columns of the *Point du Jour* and on the floor of the assembly, Barère pleaded for their political emancipation and ridiculed the "blind and sanguinary fanaticism that was soiling the reign of Louis XVI."[18] Strangely enough, however, in the agitation for civil equality for the negroes in the French colonies, Barère was silent, lifting his voice only once, and then to echo a timid compromise that did not conciliate.[19]

The same watchful liberalism, poised for flight but ever caged

those charges, M. Launay says of Barère: "Surtout il se faisait le fidèle client du père. . . . A sa suite Barère se poussa jusqu'aux premiers rangs de l'opposition."

[16] *Point du Jour,* no. 179 (session of Dec. 24, 1789) and no. 256 (Mar. 29, 1790). In commenting on the election, Barère wrote: "It is not as a victory of philosophy over religious prejudices that we must consider it, but as a public lesson in toleration that the French legislators are giving Europe."

[17] *Ibid.,* no. 518. Barère, I. 315–318.

[18] *Point du Jour,* no. 93 (Sept. 28, 1789); no. 43 (Aug. 3, 1789), where he referred to them as "a people whom misfortune has made respectable and providence sufficiently punished without needing man to aggravate their ills"; no. 289 (May 2, 1790), and no. 286, where he commented sarcastically on the people who were not yet accustomed to the idea that Jews were men, "as if they were not our fellow citizens and brothers".

[19] *Ibid.,* no. 671 (May 13, 1791).

in by the restrictions of political expediency and by the limitations of Barère's nature, distinguished his stand on the question of civil liberty. Shortly after the sacrificial orgy of August 4, he ostentatiously renounced his counselor's charge in the seneschal's court of Bigorre, alleging that he had "always grieved over the sale of judicial offices", though how he would have reconciled the retention of his office with his repeated comments on the need of elected magistrates and a free judicial administration presents a delicate problem in political ethics. He placed himself on record in favor of juries both in civil and criminal cases, only to admit at once that the occasion was not yet ripe for juries in the former.[20] His humanitarian instincts prompted him to oppose the death penalty, but those instincts broke on the rock of practical necessity. He reluctantly supported the retenion of the death penalty, explaining his stand by references to the unstable political situation and maintaining that he would be the first to vote for its abolition as soon as political conditions warranted it.[21]

His solicitude for the welfare of the *res publica* could not have been achieved save at the cost of individual liberty, and apparently he was not averse to making sacrifices for others. Early in the days of the Constituent Assembly he defended the opening of private mail on such occasions as the safety of the state required, and a year later he gave his approval to Malouet's censure of Marat's incendiary pamphlet, *C'en est Fait de Nous*.[22] But legal efforts to ferret out the authors of so-called incendiary writings and criminal prosecution of those authors impressed him as unnecessary and unduly severe. He believed it possible to achieve the intended effect by more conciliatory methods. The elaboration of his views on that subject makes an interesting revelation of his early social philosophy. "Wherever there is a country and citizens", he declared, "every one must have the right to check . . . those who violate the laws and disturb the public order", but since every one can not avail himself of "the freedom to make accusations", the citizens should name a censor, not a prosecutor, in each district to perform that civic duty for them. If the censor is inactive, public opinion will force him to perform his duties. "It will be the despotism of virtue, because the people will choose him." And "someday", he continued hopefully,

[20] *Ibid.*, no. 90 (Sept. 22, 1789); no. 52 (Aug. 11, 1789) and no. 291 (May 4, 1790); no. 288 (Apr. 30, 1790). *Cf.* his insistence also on safeguarding the rights of the accused, *ibid.*, no. 561 (Jan. 23, 1791), and his compromise on the question of a court of cassation and on criminal courts. *Arch. Parl.*, XV. 665 (May 24, 1790), and *Point du Jour*, no. 558 (Jan. 20, 1791).

[21] *Arch. Parl.*, XXVI. 685 ff. (June 1, 1791).

[22] *Point du Jour*, no. 34, pp. 302–303; no. 382 (Aug. 2, 1790).

" you will allow them [*i.e.*, the censors] to censor public manners, for in corruption itself there are certain excesses which the magistrates should prosecute as social crimes ".[23] Clearly, he had not read his Rousseau unseeingly; but that strenuous policing of the mind which he recommended, that " despotism of virtue ", was not to be introduced until Napoleon who despised the ideologists instituted it a decade or more later.

He manifested the same spirit of compromise in treating the economic and financial problems of the assembly. Again there was the balance between the claims of the individual and the exigencies of the state. Private property, good bourgeois and true son of his age that he was, Barère deemed sacred, almost beyond life itself, " property without which neither durable laws nor good lawmakers are possible ".[24] However, his tone changed in those dreadful autumn months of 1789 when everything had to be done at once and no funds were available for anything at all, when the nation approached bankruptcy, while the assembly, in Mirabeau's phrase, " still deliberated ". The crown lands were available, lands held in mortmain were available, the estates of the clergy were available, and either of those resources could save the failing government. Then once more Rousseau came to the rescue of the deputies, and with the generous sweep of people who were accustomed to ruining others, they invoked the principle of public safety to fall upon the clerical wealth. " If the sovereign ", said Barère on the 30th of October, 1789, " that is to say, the nation, wishes to alter the form of usufruct now enjoyed by a moral corps of the state [*i.e.*, the Church], if it wishes to prevent the ruin of the state by general alienations of property, it must decide by political law and not by civil law. . . . Nations may never be accused of despotism because no one can conceive of nations wishing to injure themselves." [25] Three days later the assembly placed the clerical estates at the disposition of the nation. There may be some question whether Barère was expressing the true spirit of the Revolutionists or merely drifting along more passively with the current; there is no doubt that he was adding to his prestige as a political influence.

On two later occasions when the matter of private and national property came up, he contrived to reunite his unreconciled attitudes in a single, if compromising, decision. The first of these occasions was his decision to respect the abolition of the tithe, but to compensate

[23] *Arch. Parl.*, XVII. 672–673 (Aug. 9, 1790).

[24] *Point du Jour*, no. 55 (Aug. 14, 1789). *Cf.* also *Arch. Parl.*, XVI. 597–598 (July 1, 1790): " private property, in the eyes of the true legislator is an impregnable bedrock of the social order."

[25] *Point du Jour*, no. 121.

the owners of the infeudated tithes;[26] the second was his conciliatory reports for the committee on domains on the complex and delicate problem of the royal domains. The problem was complicated by political considerations. Barère confesses in his *Mémoires* that royal pressure was placed upon him to save as much as he dared for the king; and he allowed himself to be influenced by his traditional loyalty to the monarch as well as by the more practical consideration of winning royal favor. On the other hand, he strove also to bear in mind the theoretical claims of the nation as well as the practical political consideration of not losing popular favor. Consequently, his reports pleased neither his colleagues nor the monarch, though for him they represented a venture in political dexterity.[27]

The problems of industry and commerce, of labor and wages held no appeal for him. He had no first-hand acquaintance with workingmen, nor did he, a *littérateur* and lawyer, have any capital invested in commercial or industrial ventures. The actual economic society of France was almost *terra incognita* to this theorist who undoubtedly had mastered the pontifical utterances of Turgot on guilds and trade and industry. Not a word from him in the two long years of the Constituent Assembly on the financial liquidation of the old régime. Silence complete on the assignats and the new fiscal system. One lone indication points to his orientation away from the laissez-faire doctrines of his social class. In June, 1789, he insisted that free internal trade and the abandonment of all governmental regulation were the remedies for the grain shortage; in July, 1791, he reversed his position: "When a grain shortage threatens us, do we not suspend the execution of the law which assures a free grain trade."[28] Must we repeat once more, "*c'est la faute à Rousseau*"; or may one assume that Barère was becoming increasingly aware that the Revolution was a social movement as well as political?

More readily, he applied himself to the absorbing task of reorganizing the political and administrative system of the kingdom. He felt at home in that field of rational endeavor where, against the dead authority of history with its inheritance of tyranny and slavery, with its record of frustration of every attempt to establish political liberty, he could oppose the conception of man's natural rights. In common with the liberal publicists of the day he took his stand on

[26] *Ibid.*, no. 273 (Apr. 14, 1790).

[27] For the reports, *cf. Arch. Parl.*, XII. 633–642 (Apr. 10, 1790); XV. 450–452 (May 9, 1790); XVII. 630–635 (Aug. 6, 1790); XVIII. 86 (Aug. 15, 1790); XVIII. 723–728 (Sept. 13, 1790); XXVI. 468–472 (May 26, 1791); *Point du Jour*, Aug. 20, 1791; *Arch. Parl.*, XXX. 216 (Sept. 5, 1791). *Cf.* also Barère, I. 289–291.

[28] *Point du Jour*, nos. 3 (June 19, 1789) and 732 (July 9, 1791).

Turgot's cardinal dictum that the rights of men living in society were not founded on their annals, but on their nature. In his plans for the future, he rejected the aid of the past. On the very day that the States-General became the National Assembly, he expressed the ideal that inspired the great majority of the deputies: that they were assembled not to maintain a constitution which, somehow, was submerged in the past history of France, but to establish one. Once the principle of the ideal authority of reason was triumphantly incarnated in the Declaration of Rights, the deputies proceeded to its elaboration in the constitution, though not without having a few articles violate the implications of the Declaration. Suffrage rights were curtailed by dividing the electorate into active and passive citizens. In that respect Barère shared the prejudices of his contemporaries. The *philosophes,* the example of America and England, and the deep instinctive fear that the literate entertain of the untutored and impoverished masses disposed him to set apart certain citizens as unworthy of the vote. He also favored the exclusion of wage servants from the ranks of active citizens because "they do not have a free and independent will, such as is needed to exercise political rights". Moreover, he approved of the provision that candidates for election to the National Assembly possess a minimum amount of landed property, lest "the state be given over to men who are less attached to their country". But he opposed the recommendation that candidates pay a *marc d'argent* in taxes for fear that that provision would exclude artists, men of letters, "and that infinitely useful and necessary class of small farmers, whom we must always consider in the constitution of an agricultural nation".[29]

If he acquiesced in what must have seemed a minor detail, namely, the manner of ascertaining the popular will, he was adamant on what was rightly regarded a paramount issue—the full accomplishment of the popular will through the agency of the constitution. Article 3 of the Declaration of Rights stated explicitly that the source of all sovereignty was essentially in the nation, and the 'patriots', with whom Barère voted, were unalterably opposed to any further checks upon this national sovereignty than those already provided in the Declaration. The constitution was not to be a means of restraining or regulating the national will; it was to be an instrument for accomplishing the will of the people. It is priggish to point out that the 'patriots' did not foresee the dangers of democracy. At that moment they were far more concerned with averting the revival of royal terrorism under whose irresponsible tradition France had suffered. Hence Barère fought the proposals of the 'moderates',

[29] *Point du Jour,* nos. 118 (Oct. 27, 1789) and 120 (Oct. 29, 1789).

of Lally, Mounier, and Clermont-Tonnerre, and voted for a unicameral assembly, meeting permanently, for a suspensive veto, for a responsible ministry, and against the right of the king to dissolve the assembly.[30] In the spring of 1790, his newspaper joined with Brissot's *Patriote Français* and Fréron's *Orateur du Peuple* in the press campaign to place the final responsibility for war and peace in the hands of the assembly. "In the eyes of humanity and the friends of liberty", wrote Barère with all the sententiousness of which humble figures are capable when they expound their lofty ideals, "this question is already decided. Since the nation is sovereign, it alone has the dread right of giving the signal of battle."[31] Despite the initiative that the monarch won of proposing war and concluding peace, the final decision rested with the assembly, and diplomatic negotiations were ultimately to be ratified by the deputies. The nation became a copartner of the executive power in the conduct of foreign affairs; and before long Barère was to extend the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people into a principle of international relations.[32]

The reorganization of the administrative units of the country gave him a remarkable opportunity to win the everlasting gratitude and support of his local constituency. He did not miss it. In his *Mémoires* he recounts the story of his successful endeavors, while a member of the committee on divisions, to maintain his native *pays* of Bigorre intact as the new department of the Hautes-Pyrénées. He wrote that account—internal evidence makes it clear—towards the very close of his long life, when the comparative tranquillity of his days in Tarbes made his checkered years in Paris appear odious, when the rustic simplicity of his earliest surroundings, the cherished dialect and the picturesque costumes that long years of tribulation had all but effaced from his memory, consoled him as he moved towards the grave. Under the influence of those impressions he recounted the story, not as it actually happened, but as it should have happened.

[30] *Cf. ibid.*, no. 72 (Sept. 4, 1789); *Arch. Parl.*, IX. 55–57 (Sept. 21, 1789); *Point du Jour*, no. 294 (May 7, 1790) and no. 605 (Mar. 7, 1791). *Cf.* Acton, *Lectures on the French Revolution*, pp. 116–117, where Lord Acton advances the argument that Barère was so apprehensive of representative democracy, so desirous of bringing the parliamentary vote into harmony with the wish of the constituency that he proposed an ingenious plan whereby every law remained suspended until the time of the next election, when the country pronounced upon it by imperative mandate. However, *cf. supra*, note 10, and *infra*, note 44, where Barère expressed himself forcefully against the imperative mandate. It is likely that the instance cited by Lord Acton is an illustration of the temporizing, political tactics of Barère rather than an unequivocal expression of his views.

[31] *Point du Jour*, no. 304. *Cf.* also nos. 306 and 312 of May, 1790.

[32] *Arch. Parl.*, XXV. 548 (May 3, 1791) and XXVI. 382 ff. (May 24, 1791).

He wrote it as though he were in 1789 an ardent champion of regional liberties, a warm supporter of the administration of *pays d'état*; and every shred of evidence from the records, even the most insignificant, shows that in 1789 and for years after no one in the assembly insisted more vehemently than Barère on the conception of a nation, one and indivisible, united under a constitution which expressed the popular will.[33] Misled by his *Mémoires* and judging only from superficial evidence, historians have agreed to interpret his action as proof positive of his federalist views.[34]

A more realistic explanation must needs concern itself with his motives in 1789 rather than his apologia four decades later. A sentimental and wholly laudable attachment to his native region, reluctance to have it dismembered and its fragments incorporated into neighboring territory, and a keen appreciation of the political expediency of posing as the stalwart defender of the territorial integrity (if not of the political independence) of Bigorre—these motives explain his deed.[35] Not without reason could Barère refer to his action as "the most pleasant and the most useful to my reputation". Useful, indeed, for he himself recorded that he received "the most flattering and the most constant marks of his fellow citizens' gratitude" and, more tangible still than gratitude, their votes for the following half century.[36] A clear mark of his not disinterested idealism may be found in the fact that he speedily followed up his first appeal to the electorate of Bigorre by obtaining two grants of money for his constituents, one of 300,000 livres for road repairs and another of 30,000 livres for poor relief.[37] His future with the citizens of the department that he helped create was now secure.

Before the Revolution the facile young lawyer prided himself on defending the cause of oppressed humanity at the bar at Toulouse. During this first phase of the Revolution, when the whole judicial system was being reorganized, the champion of justice was all but completely silent. A brief remark on the court of cassation, a plea for the establishment of a criminal court in each department, and a printed objection (which he never voiced in the assembly) to the

[33] *Cf. infra*, notes 44, 45.

[34] *Cf.* Acton, p. 257, who calls Barère "the only evident Federalist in the Convention".

[35] Had Barère been a federalist, it is inconceivable that he would have favored the establishment of primary and secondary classes of municipalities in 1789, for such a measure tended to curb or even crush active, vigorous communal life in the smaller municipalities where the influence of the priest and the local nobility would be perpetuated. *Cf. Arch. Parl.*, IX. 691 (Nov. 5, 1789).

[36] *Cf.* Barère, I. 303–310, for his own account of the affair, and I. 42–44, for the interpretation offered by the editors of his *Mémoires*.

[37] Launay, pp. 61–62.

institution of a ministry of justice—to those insignificant interventions was his rôle limited.[38] His *Mémoires* make much of his work as leading member of the committee on *lettres de cachet,* whose mission it was to investigate all irregularities concerning the imprisonment of the poor unfortunate inmates of the state prisons. "In four months", he records, "all the state prisons were opened and their use proscribed forever."[39] Perhaps the rare pleasure of serving humanity *en bloc* by liberating all the inmates of the prisons compensated him for his failure to take a more active rôle in the less spectacular and more methodical reorganization of the national system of justice; though it is permissible to think that his *Mémoires* exaggerate the magnitude of his accomplishment.[40] Of an equally casual nature was his participation in the religious reforms of the Constituent Assembly. In the absence of any recorded objection to those reforms and on the evidence of several phrases lauding the destruction of superstition and berating the hostility of the refractory clergy to the Civil Constitution, it may be concluded that he approved of the reforms without wishing to figure prominently in the debates.[41]

His outspoken and constant remarks against the enemies of the Revolutionary program and the critics of the National Assembly stand in sharp contrast to the guarded tactics that he followed to ensure his own political advancement. To maintain the unity of the assembly and to protect its dignity as the sole representation of the popular will was the ideal, perhaps, more accurately, the religious faith that inspired him during these two years. One of the earliest threats—one from which many deputies never fully recovered—was the menace of the Parisian populace. Barère endeavored to allay their fears when, with the gravest misgivings, they followed the king from Versailles to Paris to resume their deliberations in the turbulent capital. "We should be slandering it [Paris], if for a single moment we thought that the stage on which French liberty was won was to become a threat to liberty. Each one of its inhabitants will be the guardian of public law and the gauge of the safety

[38] *Cf.* respectively, *Arch. Parl.*, XV. 605 (May 24, 1790); *ibid.*, XXII. 344–345 (Jan. 21, 1791); *ibid.*, XXV. 91 ff. (Apr. 14, 1791).

[39] Barère, I. 280–288. Mirabeau, Fréteau, and the Marquis de Castellane were the other members of the committee, but Barère and the last mentioned did all the work required.

[40] *Cf.* Launay, pp. 56–57, for an able criticism of the committee's work.

[41] *Cf.* Une Lettre de Barère à Mailhe, le 24 janvier, 1791, *La Révolution Française,* XLVII. 78–80 (1904); *Point du Jour,* no. 545 (Jan. 7, 1791). One very likely reason for his silence on the question of religious reforms in general and on the Civil Constitution in particular was his desire not to alienate his young wife, who was an ardent Catholic.

of each representative of the nation." [42] He did not believe his own words, of course; his *Mémoires* and the memoirs of many deputies give the lie direct to that fine profession of faith in Paris, but his effort was a gallant one, at once hopeful and hopeless.

A more tangible danger to the molders of a new France was the open opposition of the old parlements, whose reconvocation was indefinitely adjourned by the action of the assembly early in November, 1789. Realizing at once that the adjournment was but a prelude to an ultimate dissolution, the *parlementaires* defied the decree; and the militant patriots rallied to the support of the assembly. Barère minced no words in defending the assembly. He found the parlement of Rouen guilty of the "crime of lèse-nation", for "defying the sovereign authority of the nation", and the parlement of Metz, he stated, had imperiled the state and outraged the national power.[43] But the *chambre des vacations* of the parlement of Rennes, which even refused to register the assembly's decree, outraged him into a formal statement of the rights of national sovereignty.

> They [the magistrates] speak only of giving marks of their submission *to the king,* and they use that language before *the sovereign.* . . . They speak of the *rights of the Breton nation,* as if there were two nations in France. . . . They reminded you of the cahiers 'impératifs' which they call *the limits of your authority,* and yet those same cahiers 'impératifs', negated by the constitution, were retracted when the three orders were convoked throughout the entire kingdom. . . . No doubt, loyalty to provincial constitutions was laudable wher only the provinces had constitutions, when their rights rested on legitimate treaties or on ancient charters, when there was a great monarchy and no patrie. . . . When despotism degraded France, the powers of the parlements were an evil which checked a greater one. . . . But when liberty awakens, when a great constitution regenerates all the provinces, uniting them into a single body, to invoke such claims at this moment is opposing the general freedom, denying the true sovereignty of the state.[44]

Thus, his conception of liberty was thoroughly Rousseauist: freedom to obey the fundamental laws of the state. "Philosophy has invented nothing more sublime", he observed, "than the concept of binding each member of society by the expression of the general will. . . . To be free, we must be slaves of the law. . . . Such are the words that we must address to Frenchmen . . . for laws are maintained only by entertaining inviolable respect for them and by executing unquestioningly everything that they command." [45]

[42] *Point du Jour,* no. 103.

[43] *Arch. Parl.,* IX. 730 (Nov. 9, 1789) and X. 84 (Nov. 17, 1789).

[44] *Ibid.,* XI. 151–153 (Jan. 11, 1790).

[45] *Ibid.,* XXIII. 575 ff. (Feb. 28, 1791). An additional reason for obeying the laws was the threat of anarchy which lawlessness invited—"and in anarchy", he concluded impressively, "no property is safe".

He was so absorbed with defining the limits of national sovereignty and establishing impregnable bulwarks of defense against the expected attacks of the royalist and aristocratic factions that he failed to provide the individual citizen with any mode of protection against the tyranny of the popular will. A long period of time was to elapse and many democratic excesses were to be committed in the name of national sovereignty before the danger from that point was generally realized. Barère himself required the tonic effect of proscription and imprisonment, before he became aware of the harsh cruelty that so often characterizes the democratic rule of the majority. In the early days of the Constituent Assembly, he stated the attitude that he maintained consistently through the entire Revolution. "What does it matter", he demanded rhetorically, "that individual interests . . . are wounded, when we are creating a constitution; our task is to ascertain if the mass of citizens will be more happy." He might have added, of course, that he would always take exceedingly good care to have his individual interests coincide, or at least not conflict patently, with the majority's pursuit of happiness. He was prepared even to sacrifice the inalienable rights of his fellow citizens whenever that safety of the state was in danger. Before the "supreme law of national security", the "rights of man and of the citizen must bow in respect . . . [it] suspends all civic rights, and each citizen gives up all other tasks to come to the common defense".[46] One may without exaggerating take note in passing that the conception of a nation in arms, of the levy in mass which Barère helped elaborate two years later when the republican government faced its greatest crisis, was already present in his mind when he spoke those words.

One may note, further, that Barère's attitude illustrates one of the most deeply rooted convictions of the political thinkers of the eighteenth century, that conviction which Rousseau in his paradoxical manner expressed when he stated that "those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand anything about either the one or the other". For Barère fastened his faith upon *la patrie*, upon a state that was founded on good laws, that ensured the material and moral happiness of its citizens. He transferred the mental characteristics of his belief in Catholicism, which he could no longer accept, to his worship of the fatherland. The emotional intensity once focused upon the celebration of Catholic rites was suffused into the adoration of civic duties. In such a faith, the function of the minister was self-evident; as Barère expressed it: "Ministers must teach love of *la patrie* whose children they are."[47] Religion had

[46] *Point du Jour*, nos. 132 (Nov. 11, 1789) and 732 (July 9, 1791).

[47] *Arch. Parl.*, XXIII. 575 ff. (Feb. 28, 1791).

resolved itself into a civic function of the state. Its rôle was to make good citizens; while the state which promoted the moral happiness of its members could not fail to make them good men. His very terminology shows how completely religious his political credo had become. To describe the momentous Revolutionary act that sober historians, untouched by the flame of his faith, call the overthrow of the Bastille, Barère conjured forth the figure of "a holy insurrection",[48] which nothing less than a religious symbol could commemorate for posterity. Political liberty, which students of theory prosaically explain as a concept of the Western mind, Barère described as a "divinity", "fit object of public worship". And as the assembly progressed in its majestic reconstruction of the country, he made note of the new faith that was rising in France—"a sort of religious worship, established by law".[49]

If this discussion of the intense, terrific devotion with which Barère turned all his energies to establishing the Rousseauist state gives the impression of a single-minded fanatic or martyr, the impression is totally misleading. A single purpose dominated his political speculation, it is true; but a wide choice of the means of reaching his goal characterized his actions. In the summer of 1790 he temporarily forsook the Jacobins and regaled himself in the sumptuous quarters of the *Société de 1789* at the Palais Royal, where he could consult a well-chosen library, idle through the political journals, conduct a leisurely correspondence and, conversing amiably with the members, clarify his thoughts—and theirs—on current topics. Many old Jacobins were there—Mirabeau, Sieyès, Talleyrand, La Fayette, Bailly, Condorcet, Brissot, and others—men not less revolutionary perhaps at that moment than the Jacobins who remained in their modest hall in the rue Saint-Honoré, but men of greater means, of more refined tastes, of gentler birth. One may imagine the pleasure and the pride with which Barère mingled in that aristocratic circle and discussed revolutionary topics. But neither fasting with the Jacobins nor feasting with the *Société de 1789* entirely satisfied his restless, intriguing nature. A few months later, we find him attending the meetings of the *Cercle Social*, listening to the Messianic mysticism of Abbé Fauchet and Nicholas Bonneville and their plans of a socialistic state. It would be instructive to know the reasons that drew him from the wealthiest and most placid republican grouping to the poorest and the most searching, and ultimately from both extremes to the middle path of the Jacobins whom

[48] *Ibid.*, XIX. 433–434 (Oct. 4, 1790).

[49] *Point du Jour*, nos. 330 (June 21, 1790) and 756 (Aug. 4, 1791).

he rejoined in December of the same year.[50] His oft-repeated interest in all mankind, perhaps; but a more immediate explanation would not overlook the ambition of the aspiring politician who knew how to make friends and inspire confidence among his wide circle of acquaintances.

After his return to the Jacobins, he made honorable amends for his late lapse from orthodoxy by singing the praises of their recognized leader. Throughout the spring of 1791, his journal made more than one eulogistic reference to the Incorruptible: "M. Robespierre, who does not temporize with principles", "M. Robespierre, ever severe like principles and reason itself", "M. Robespierre spoke up with that zeal which he always employs in the interests of humanity."[51] On the other hand, despite officious concern for "the precious health" of the king, Barère underwent a change of heart towards Louis XVI., whom, in October, 1789, he hailed as "the most popular, the most just, and the most dearly-loved monarch in Europe". The rumors of the king's secret intrigues were in circulation among the deputies, and Barère, shifting steadily towards the more extreme position held by "the thirty voices" whom Mirabeau could not silence with his thunder, presumed to caution the nation against the monarch. In February, 1791, it was the departure of *Mesdames*, the king's aunts, which provoked a discussion on the right of emigration from the kingdom, and Barère bluntly denied the king's right to do so.[52] Two months later, when Louis XVI. sought to veil his secret acceptance of the queen's insane scenario of a flight to the frontier by professing his whole-hearted allegiance to the Revolution, Barère and Robespierre counseled caution. "Let it [the delegation which the assembly sent to the king to express the representatives' pleasure and thankfulness] be mindful", pleaded the former, "of its obligations to the nation, and may it be firm and steadfast." Robespierre, more acidly, suggested that the king was not to be thanked but congratulated on obeying the constitution.[53] Two more months elapsed, and the degradation of the monarchy which Mirabeau had labored to avert was completed in the fiasco of the flight to Varennes. The royal memorandum which Louis XVI. left behind in the Tuileries was read to the deputies; and Barère commented on it curtly and bitterly—"a production scarcely flatter-

[50] *Cf.* "Barère", August Kuściński, *Dictionnaire des Conventionnels*, p. 24; Aulard, *La Société des Jacobins*, I. 407 (Dec. 15, 1790); Launay, pp. 56–58; Sagnac, I. 293 ff.

[51] *Point du Jour*, nos. 571, 653, 668.

[52] *Ibid.*, nos. 99 (Oct. 4, 1789), 595 (Feb. 25, 1791), 598 (Feb. 28, 1791), and 612 (March, 1791).

[53] *Arch. Parl.*, XXV. 314 (Apr. 23, 1791).

ing to the heart and mind of its author". With Robespierre and Buzot he opposed the constitutional committee's scheme of exculpating the discredited monarch by accepting the fiction that Louis XVI. was the victim of an abduction. He objected to having the declaration of the royal pair received by two deputies chosen by the assembly, while the other accomplices of the evasion were to be tried before a court of law. "The law can never degrade anyone", said Robespierre, and Barère echoed him—"We must give them [the courts] all the necessary support and confidence".[54] In spite of their efforts, the Constituents voted to try only the "abductors" of the king.

For a short period after the massacre of the Champ de Mars, Barère was at odds with "that pure, steadfast, and disinterested patriot", Robespierre, whose "wise, measured, and vigorous opinion" he had been following for the preceding six months.[55] The fortnight that succeeded the return of the captured monarch to Paris was taken up by a prolonged, meticulous discussion and controversy on the benefits and disadvantages of a republican form of government for France. But not only a discussion, for the extremists, who demanded the abdication of the monarch, drew up incendiary petitions in Paris. The flow of petitions and petitioners is difficult to follow; the motives, both of those who were satisfied with the suspension of the king and those who stormed and fumed for his abdication, harder still. Few deputies even among the extreme left were prepared to accept a republic for France, not even Robespierre himself, who on July 13, 1791, declared before his Jacobin admirers that he was both a monarchist and a republican, because France "was a republic with a monarch". Barère, most assuredly, was not ready to vote for a republic, nor even for the "replacement of Louis XVI. by all constitutional means", as the Jacobins for a moment advocated. From the former alternative he shrunk, for fear of the war that it would unleash and for fear of a social revolution; from the latter proposal he turned away, for it meant the establishment of a regency. Consequently, in the final vote on the question of the king, he reversed his first attitude and voted, on July 16, not for Louis's abdication, but for his suspension. He did more. Dismayed by the Jacobins' passing support of an ambiguously worded petition against

[54] *Point du Jour*, nos. 712, 718; also *Arch. Parl.*, XXVII. 540–541 (June 26, 1791).

[55] *Point du Jour*, nos. 674 and 676 (May 16 and May 19, 1791), when he accepted the spirit of Robespierre's proposal in respect to excluding the members of the Constituent Assembly from the succeeding one, but modified the literal articles. *Cf.* also his support of Robespierre in the question of annexing the Comtat Venaissin to France.

the king, dismayed still more by the bloody fusillade on the 17th at the Champ de Mars, he quit the Jacobins with 364 others, and joined the Feuillants in protest. In communicating the news of the great scission to the local Jacobins at Tarbes, he stressed the reasons that led him to take the step. It is significant that he criticized the Jacobins [of Paris] for their lack of prudence. *Prudence,* how often did he allow it to guide his actions! "The true friends of the Constitution", he wrote, "are now meeting at the Feuillants. The doctrines of republicanism are as hostile to the happiness of France as the doctrines of an elective and executive council."[56] But he quickly realized his error and, before rejoining the Jacobins, fought the conservative revision of the constitution which, by strengthening the powers of the king, was to check the renewed agitation of the democrats and the republicans.[57] Less than two months after leaving the Jacobins, he returned to their fold, using the occasion of his election to the presidency of the Feuillants to make a plea for reconciliation under the ægis of the newly revised constitution which a delegation of deputies, of whom he was one, had brought to the king.[58]

Before the month of October began, the Constituent Assembly ended its labors, and for a year Barère withdrew from active political life.

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY. LEO GERSHOY.

[56] Launay, p. 77.

[57] For his opposition to the conservative revision of the constitution, *cf. Point du Jour,* nos. 764, 768, 780 (Aug. 11, 15, 20, 1791). For his return to the Jacobins and his vain effort to bring his fellow Feuillants along with him, *cf.* Sagnac, I. 322.

[58] Aulard, *Société des Jacobins,* III. 122, note 2. The *Chronique de Paris* of September 10, which Aulard quotes, referred on that occasion to Barère as "M. Barère de Vieuzac, that incorruptible deputy, who has never deviated from his principles". M. Launay, in his recent study of Barère, takes the time-honored attitude that Barère shifted his allegiance entirely out of considerations of political expediency. If that were so, his act would still be without onus, for the Revolutionaries moved in a world where political expediency was a vital motive. They did not float in the rarefied atmosphere of the ethical cosmos in which so many historians conduct their speculations about past politics. In this particular instance, motives of political expediency did not conflict with the sincerity of Barère's plea.

SOUTHERN NATIONALISM IN SOUTH CAROLINA IN 1851

In the general shifting of perspective which characterizes present day study of American history, motive is returning to its rightful place as the central clew to political values. In many cases, it will not do any longer to narrate events as they were narrated fifteen years ago. Especially is this true of all phases of the struggle of the sections. In no respect is a new point of view more aggressive than in the basic matter, how sectional consciousness came into existence. When and why the inhabitants of the states below the Line formed the idea that they constituted a "South", when and why they formed the idea that they were part of a social unit larger than any one state but smaller than the Union, is still a nut to crack. But that such an idea was somehow formed, that what may be called "Southern Nationalism" was not so old as the Union but older than the Civil War, few students to-day will have the rashness to deny. There is something to be said for placing it not later than the election of 1848. In that year, in South Carolina, occurred an attempt to break away from the national political parties. Though the masses of the people agreed with the Charleston *Mercury* in supporting Cass, there was an independent movement. A portion of the Democratic party attempted to make the presidential choice a matter of personal confidence in the candidates; they considered Cass a "political trickster" whom they refused to trust, and set up an all-Southern ticket composed of Taylor and Butler.[1] They proved to have little strength, however, and when the legislature voted for presidential electors it gave 129 votes to Cass and Butler, twenty-seven to Taylor and Butler, with eight blank.[2] But they had made a momentous rift in the Democratic organization and had engendered bitterness that outlived the campaign.[3]

This all-Southern movement centered in Charleston and hardly had the campaign closed than a meeting was held which may be considered historic. On October 31, 1848, the Taylor men assem-

[1] "If Charleston does her duty there will not be twenty Taylor votes in the next Legislature. . . ." *Mercury*, Oct. 10, 1848. See also the issues for July 21 and Oct. 25.

[2] *Ibid.*, Nov. 8, Charleston had sent to this legislature thirteen representatives and a senator, all Taylor men. See letter quoted in *Mercury*, Oct. 25, 1848.

[3] See refusal of certain Cass Democrats to affiliate with Taylor Democrats, *Mercury*, Dec. 12, 1848.

bled, chose Henry A. De Saussure to preside over them, named forty-four vice presidents, and adopted eleven resolutions which sketched a party organization, advocated a general convention of all the Southern states, and invited "the co-operation of all who believed with us that a struggle of great and vital importance is before us" in the formation of a Southern States Rights Republican party.[4] This new organization issued a circular, widely distributed, and at once set about stimulating the organization of similar societies.[5]

Though Calhoun does not seem to have participated in starting the movement, some of his friends did. One of these, H. W. Conner, was among the forty-four vice presidents. He wrote to Calhoun immediately after the initial meeting:

> I must express my belief that there has been and probably still is a design to revive the old Bluffton move and with the same motive and end. I do not think that Co^{l} Memminger or Co^{l} Elmore favour it at least not as a present mode of action—but Rhett and others do. I do not think it will obtain favour—*I should regret it exceedingly if it did* for I believe the only means efficient and practicable for our purpose is a conciliation or cooperation by some joint action on the part of all the Slave states. . . .[6]

When Conner referred to Rhett and Bluffton, intimating that he and his friends saw things one way, Rhett another, he marked a line of cleavage that was destined to render vain his hopes of a general Southern coöperation, that was to split the secession movement of 1851 into irreconcilable parts. The earlier miniature secession movement of "the Bluffton boys", of 1844, is thus another ancestor of the situation of 1851.[7] Needless to say, Rhett was its central figure; and Rhett, his psychology, his political vision, still remain a great chance for a biographer. Only one suggestion is in point here. When, at Bluffton, he enunciated the same views which formed his gospel seven years later, he was forty-four years old; in the later episode he was fifty-one. He was not, apparently, one of those highly flexible intellects that can form new conceptions in

[4] *Mercury*, Nov. 2, 1848.

[5] The *Mercury*, Nov. 16, printed resolutions of a meeting in Fairfield district plainly derived from the Charleston resolutions.

[6] J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, Am. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1899, II. 1185. As to Conner and the others of the forty-four, it is illuminating to trace them through the later committees and associations of the "Coöperationist" party of which their premature attempt was the direct forerunner.

[7] The historic significance of that movement of midsummer, 1844, is summed up in a letter from Elmore to Calhoun, Aug. 26, 1844. *Ibid.*, p. 967. In almost all respects the Bluffton movement was a foreshadowing on a small scale of the movement of 1851. Rhett's memory of his earlier defeat may explain a part of the stubbornness with which he fought against its repetition in 1851.

middle life. His political bent, it would seem, was determined by the Nullification episode; he saw later issues always from the standpoint of 1832. His attitude in the episode we are approaching was summed up by an editorial in the *Mercury* which spoke exultantly of the two "secessions" of South Carolina in the past—from the empire in 1776, and from the Union in 1832—and prophesied a similar success in a third secession soon to take place.[8] Apparently Rhett was fixed in a belief that secession, whenever it should come, would be 1832 over again on a large scale, ending in a more complete success; and therefore he had no qualms in urging his state to force the fighting whenever it felt inclined.

But there was a delay in precipitating the issue. The organizations of 1848 were not destined to continue. The Southern States Rights Republican party died quietly in its infancy. None the less, in the alignments of the close of 1848 we find the basis of those other alignments on which the coming battle over secession was to be fought out. On the one hand, Rhett and the interior of the state; on the other, Charleston with its dependencies, its intellectual, social, even financial dependencies. On the latter side there was not, as on the other, a single dominating personality. Three men stand out conspicuous above others—Langdon Cheves, A. P. Butler, R. W. Barnwell—and among these the central figure appears to be Butler. The contrast of Rhett and Butler intellectually, temperamentally, will yet delight some acute analyzer who loves to track individuality to its inmost lair. Still more illuminating when at last it emerges from the clouds of contemporaneous rhetoric and subsequent pedantry that have obscured so much of the mid-century, giving us blurred impressions both of the hearts and the heads of the men of that day, still more illuminating will be the contrast of their constituencies; most interesting of all will be the forming of an adequate mental image, a true estimate of the effect upon American history, of that lovely, calm, reserved city, Charleston. When all these at last have their innings, in that happy day when the human soul victorious over mere statistics is reinstated as an historical factor, we shall see that there were different types of courage, different political emotions, no less than differing interests, which found their voices, on the one hand in Rhett, on the other hand in Butler.

The clash of these two powers in South Carolina politics was fortuitously delayed. Calhoun, following a course not identical with that of either—though much nearer to Butler's than to Rhett's—spent his closing strength in a last attempt to consolidate the South as a separate unit within the Union. The result was the Nashville

[8] *Mercury*, July 11, 1851.

Convention. That interesting and neglected incident, though it produced no obvious consequences, at least gave to the group of South Carolinians opposed to Rhett one of their watchwords—the demand for a general Southern congress by which the policy of all the Southern states should be determined. For a time in 1850 the two groups in South Carolina, with Rhett and Butler as their symbols, had seemed in a fair way to lose their identities. The demand for the congress, conflicting as it did with the older idea of separate state action, restored them.

Herein lies buried the chief consideration in the reorientation of the episode. So far as I am aware, the students who have given it any attention have assumed that the basic issue was remaining in, or going out of, the Union. The traditional Northern view, having very little knowledge of the event, has taken Southern phraseology at what seemed to be face value, and supposed there was a conflict in the South, in 1851 and 1852, between "nationalism", as Northerners have understood the term, and state rights. An eminent scholar for whose work none of us have anything but respect for once makes a slip. He speaks of a convention in South Carolina in 1852 in which nineteen votes were cast against the doctrine of the right to secede. It will appear in a moment that the doctrine was not an issue before the convention, and there is no ground for asserting that a single vote was cast against it. The real issue will appear as the policy of Rhett develops.

Rhett came boldly out for his unfaltering "Bluffton" view in a speech he delivered at Charleston just after his return from the first of the two Nashville meetings. He remarked that on his way home he perceived that the upper part of the state was preparing for resistance.[9] He thought that the whole state should do the same, should follow her own course even if the other Southern states abandoned her. "Smaller states have before us", he said, "struggled successfully for their independence and freedom against greater odds."[10]

[9] This speech was delivered on June 21, 1850, and printed at length in the *Mercury*, July 20. Comment on this speech by Clay and others caused the *Mercury*, July 29, to make the amiable editorial remark that it had "raised a terrible dust among the political rubbish at Washington".

[10] In connection with this speech it is well to remember the spell cast by mere analogy upon the men of that day. For example, in the course of this controversy came out a pamphlet, *An Address on the Question of Separate States Secession*, by Lewis Malone Ayer, jr., Charleston, 1851, which on page 17 argues: "Something like forty different independent States at this moment exist in Europe of smaller area than South-Carolina—some of them having maintained their sovereignty and freedom for many centuries. And it is a fact as notorious as it is encouraging to us, that liberty has always and ever been best and longest preserved

There seems to be little doubt that almost all South Carolinians in the summer of 1850 were in favor of some sort of secession. The issue was not upon seceding or not seceding but upon seceding alone or in concert.[11] What appears to have been a spontaneous general impulse showed itself in the organization of the Southern Rights associations. These do not seem to have been survivals or even formal revivals of the associations inspired by the meeting of October 31, 1848. That the earlier associations had lapsed seems plain, in spite of the fact that the demarcation they indicated had not disappeared and was destined to be the determining detail of the approaching crisis. Now, as then, the two powers in South Carolina were to fight out between them a crucial issue. But this does not seem to have been patent in midsummer, 1850, when the stir for the new associations began. Their immediate inspiration as well as the fact that there were none such then active in the state is indicated by a passage in the *South Carolinian* commenting on the meeting at Augusta which had resolved in favor of forming clubs "in every county of the State and the South for the purpose of procuring

in small States." The same argument is defended from the history of Athens, Switzerland, Venice, Holland, Poland, Modern Greece, and the Caucasus, in *Separate State Secession Practically Discussed,* by Rutledge, Edgefield, 1851. It is worth remembering also that Kossuth had recently fixed the attention of America upon Hungary and the woes of subordinate states. In a pamphlet, *An Address Delivered to the Freemen of Chesterfield District,* March, 1851, by the Rev. J. C. Coit, Columbia, 1851, page 26: "The central regency has usurped the powers and prerogatives of sovereigns. . . . States that are not satisfied with the new basis of Union cannot be kept in it but by force; nor by force, unless Russian and Austrian despotism reigns, and disaffected States are to meet the fate of Hungary." In the "Rutledge pamphlet" the Hungarian failure is explained away and a lesson drawn upon the dangers of jealousy among confederates.

[11] It can not be asserted that there were no exceptions, though the opponents of secession were as a rule extremely sensitive upon their orthodoxy with regard to the right to secede. The voices raised in defense of the Union were very few and only now and then does one come upon such a passage as the following from a short pamphlet by W. J. Grayson, dated Oct. 17, 1850, and entitled *Letter to His Excellency Whitemarsh B. Seabrook . . . on the Dissolution of the Union,* Charleston, 1850: "This then is the substance of the foregoing remarks; that the Union is the source of peace prosperity and power to the Nation, and its dissolution would be followed by disorder, violence, and civil wars; that if the present Confederacy is broken up, the formation of any other would be difficult and its continuance impossible; that no causes exist to justify the destruction of the Union; that the measures lately adopted by Congress are not infringements on our constitutional rights, if they were, they are of common concern to the whole South; that the wrong of which we complain, comes from the people of certain States, and the appropriate remedy would be a cessation of social intercourse; that the mere apprehension of aggressions for the future will not justify the resort to extreme measures for the present; that the South will lose nothing by waiting, she is rapidly advancing in wealth, population, and power, and nothing can arrest her progress but the imprudence of her own people, and the rashness of her leaders."

unity of action and disseminating light among the people". Said the *South Carolinian*:

> We believe the formation of these associations would do much to unite the people of the South. . . . In South Carolina it may be said we are all united yet still, for the sake of a concert with each other, in the various districts of the State, and with the people of our sister States, it would be well probably that such associations should be formed in every district of the State.[12]

It was in September and October that the new Southern Rights associations began to spring up on every hand. The papers of those months record the formation of a great number in all parts of the state, generally, though not always, with the same constitution. This typical constitution was adopted by the Charleston organization—officially the "Southern Rights Association of St. Philip and St. Michael"—which was formed at a mass meeting of the people of these two Charleston parishes, October 3.[13]

The irregular second meeting of the Nashville Convention, falling in soon afterward, does not seem to have had any material effect on the situation. It is fair to assume that the convention's failure strengthened Rhett and the separatists—if so we may call them—in their resolve not to wait for the rest of the South; and there is also good evidence that it did not discourage the opposition faction. Few names were held in greater respect in South Carolina than that of Langdon Cheves. He was present at Nashville and delivered

[12] Quoted in the *Mercury*, July 30, 1850. A letter in the *Mercury*, Oct. 1, began: "Is it not time, Messrs. Editors, that steps should be taken to form" such an association in Charleston?

[13] *Mercury*, Oct. 4, 1850. The constitution is printed in full. It provides for a Committee of Safety of twenty-five and a Committee of Correspondence of twenty, as well as for other officers; for regular quarterly meetings; for the appointment of delegates to other associations. The closing article reads:

"The Association shall continue in existence and persevere in its efforts until the wrongs of the South are redressed, or the State resume the powers heretofore delegated to the United States for special purposes."

The lists of officers and the committees are given and these show that the division between the factions that was so soon to revive was still temporarily in abeyance. Rhett was present and addressed the meeting. Among the six vice presidents was H. W. Conner. Other names hark back to the meeting of October 31, 1848, and still others point forward to the time, then fast approaching, when they, under Rhett's lead, should again be at swords' points with the others.

An editorial in the same issue gives this interesting detail: "The announcement that Mississippi had taken her stand by the side of Georga in the great Southern movement, was greeted with acclamations, and three cheers were given for the gallant Gov. Quitman." Quitman's proclamation of September 26 is printed on the same page.

a speech that was looked upon in South Carolina as the chief event of the meeting. In the course of it he said:[14]

> We meet on a melancholy occasion. It is to devise the means of defending the Southern States. . . .
>
> I will now speak of our ability to resist by secession, should it be opposed. If Virginia shall lead, I have not the least apprehension that any blood will be spilt. . . . The power of the government of the United States to subdue any two or three considerable States, seems out of the question. It is hard to subdue a free people. . . .
>
> But if our great parent State leads us, there will be no bloodshed; and can it be doubted that she will? . . . It is impossible. We shall be united. . . .

It is plain, then, that as late as November, 1850, the two factions in South Carolina politics had not resumed that open antagonism which they had confessed at the close of 1848. Both the Rhett faction and the Cheves-Butler-Barnwell faction had come out unconditionally for secession. Though they had outlined different programs—Rhett being for individual action by South Carolina; his opponents, for holding back until all the South should act in concert—they had not yet drawn the line of division hard and fast, had not consolidated into parties on that irreconcilable difference in program.[15] And no one, as yet, could have felt warranted in ascribing to the Rhett faction the control of the situation. But very soon there was a change. Between November, 1850, and May, 1851, the Rhett faction clutched a brief control. How? That is the question and two events of late November, perhaps, help us toward an answer.

Quitman, in Mississippi, took his bold stand with the legislature which appeared to be prepared to follow him. All parties in South Carolina were watching Mississippi with intense interest. The state of things there, in November, must have operated powerfully to encourage Rhett and all others who wished to force the issue at

[14] Editorial in the *Mercury*, Nov. 22, 1850. The speech was reported in the same issue and was also printed as a pamphlet, *Speech of Hon. Langdon Cheves, in the Southern Convention, November 14, 1850*. Columbia, 1850.

[15] See note 13. This is further demonstrated by the elections of October, 1850. In choosing the new legislature secession was not an issue. It was taken for granted. There were various tickets in the field differentiated by local considerations. The Charleston newspapers print the "Carolina Ticket", "The Ticket for the Crisis", the "Workingmen's Ticket", "Southern Rights Ticket", "Merchants' Ticket", the ticket of "The South Hand in Hand for its Rights", and several independent tickets without names. The various groups of candidates on these tickets so overlap that it appears impossible to find clearly dividing lines. Had the issue between secession and opposition to secession been made elsewhere in the state surely it would have been reflected in the election at Charleston.

once.[16] But there was another, a very singular incident, that for the moment seemed to throw the game into the hands of the separatists. On November 27, four companies of United States artillery coming up from Florida arrived at Charleston and were landed at Fort Moultrie and Castle Pinckney.[17] Three days later, the *Mercury* printed this editorial:

> It is said that the troops landed here the other day are on their way to Texas—whether to help the Texans, or the New Mexicans, or the Comanches, we are not informed. By the way, a telegraphic despatch in a Northern paper states that the rumor of this "movement on Charleston", produced a great excitement in Savannah. We are not so excitable here and Mr. Fillmore might send the whole of his disposable forces without raising much anxiety.

On second thought, however, the *Mercury* saw the matter in a different light, and came out with a flaming editorial denouncing the government as intending to overawe the city by military force.[18]

This obscure incident of the sudden increase of the Federal garrison at Charleston bears on the present question only because of the flare of excitement it produced. The idea that Rhett and his followers seized the opportunity and fanned the flame falls in with

[16] The tone of the *Mercury's* editorials is significant evidence. See also the passage at arms between Rhett and Foote, in the Senate, the following year, on the question of Rhett's former attitude toward Quitman: *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., pp. 52 ff. The South Carolina letters in Claiborne's *Quitman* are generally familiar.

[17] *Mercury*, Nov. 28, 1850.

[18] The ostensible cause of the *Mercury's* indignation was the message of Governor Seabrook which had been submitted to the legislature on November 26, and in which he said: "As Castle Pinckney, with the three acres around it, is deemed by the General Government essential to the safety of Charleston, in the event of a foreign war, my application for its retro-cession to the State, has been unsuccessful." *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina . . . 1850* (printed), p. 24. Commenting on this, Dec. 3, the *Mercury* went so far as to say: "The Governor's Message affords one of the proofs that they (the Government) understand the feeling of South Carolina. They have refused to relinquish the site of Castle Pinckney, on the pretext that it is necessary to the defense of Charleston in the event of a foreign war,—but in reality because its guns can be brought to bear on the city. Another proof has just come to our ear. There were twenty thousand stand of arms in the United States Arsenal, deposited here to be ready to supply the wants of our militia. They have been all removed, we understand, and that with such precaution that no suspicion of the proceeding was entertained till it was all over. We put the like interpretation on the recent accession of troops to Fort Moultrie, about which, of course, there are plausible stories, the source of which we know not. The troops are here on their way to some point but not to move until they are ordered. Troops need rest occasionally, and Texas is a long way off; besides that, having accepted the ten million dollars, and surrendered the sixty million acres of land, the Comanches are no longer considered so dangerous as to call for a large force in that quarter."

the tone of the *Mercury's* second editorial and may account for the sharp increase of activity in December on the part of the separatists.[19] Though the *Mercury* again changed its tone,[20] there was nothing pacific in the attitude of its friends in the short session of the legislature during December, 1850.

Propositions were made for military defense and bills were considered providing for non-intercourse with the North and for a border police to deal with persons coming into the state.[21] There was also high discussion, and a great deal of it bearing upon two absorbing questions—Should the state proceed at once to secession? Should it fill the vacant place in the United States Senate?

It was on the former issue, naturally, that the fight was hottest. A number of resolutions of widely different tenor, but all looking to some sort of secession, were introduced in both Houses. In the lower House all this matter was referred to the Committee of the Whole which discussed it day after day. Here the line between the two factions seems to have been clearly drawn and henceforth we may think of the Rhett faction by the term they appropriated to themselves, secessionists, and of the opposite faction by the term

[19] Irritation with regard to the troops did not quickly pass away. The most singular incident in a long bickering was the refusal of the Federal commandant to permit the usual celebration of the battle of Sullivan's Island inside the walls of Fort Moultrie, in the following June. The celebration was held in a tent outside the walls of the fort. Rhett made an address. Many months afterward in Congress, Foote charged him with having attempted on that occasion to stir up the people to extreme measures, even sought to give the impression—without strictly committing himself to the assertion—that Rhett advised an attack on the Federal forts at Charleston. The language which he quotes is indeed violent but the interpretation put upon it is disingenuous. Foote continues: "Such was the gusty language of the Senator to an assembly of excited citizens. Imagining himself to be the Henry of the present time, he thunders forth with that magnificent voice of his, and in that imposing oratorical manner which has given him so much distinction as a public speaker—'Let us fight'." *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., p. 60. This is worth preserving if only for the malicious thumbnail sketch of the style of a great popular speaker. Rhett made no reply though the report of his Sullivan's Island speech in the *Mercury*, July 7, 1851, is very different from the quotation of Foote. His courtly rival, Butler, rose in his defense, and said to the Senate that when the administration had sent troops to Charleston "for what purpose . . . is not distinctly understood. The effect was to arm all parties with a determination to resent the insulting demonstration; and it was difficult for her public men to restrain excitement and control consequences." *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., p. 95. Is it not likely that Butler's words apply to December as well as to June?

[20] In an editorial "Rumors and Excitements", Dec. 20.

[21] *House Journal* (printed), pp. 124, 131, 173.

which takes up the idea that had already become their watchword, coöperationists.[22]

The issue of immediate or eventual secession was precipitated by a set of resolutions introduced into the House on December 7, calling for a bill to provide for the election of delegates to a Southern congress "whose duty it should be to co-operate with Delegates from other Southern States in forming a constitution for a Southern Confederacy". This proposed congress, based on recommendations of the Nashville Convention, was to meet on May 2, 1851; and on July 4, 1851, there was to be held a convention of the people of South Carolina to consider the aforesaid constitution; but "in the event of the aggrieved States, or any of them, failing to meet us in said Congress, or meeting, and failing to adopt a Constitution for a Southern Confederacy, the said Convention of this State should, in the opinion of this Legislature, declare South Carolina no longer a Member of this Confederacy, and proceed at once to organize an Independent Government".[23] The parliamentary battle which ensued resulted in a compromise "Bill to provide for the appointment of Deputies to a Southern Congress and to call a Convention of the People of this

[22] The debates in the Committee of the Whole are not illuminated by the official journal but are partly preserved in the newspapers and in pamphlets reprinting important speeches. This passage is a specimen of what went on: "Whereupon Mr. Memminger in a speech of nearly three hours' duration, with great force and ability, discussed the present position of this State. He deprecated immediate secession, as also separate State action, and was in favor of being fully represented in Congress; and was of the opinion that South Carolina should remain in the Union *for the present*, were it only as a fire ship, but strongly urged that annihilation or independence is our only alternative, and that secession is ultimately inevitable. . . .

"Mr. Verdier then took the floor, and strenuously advocated immediate secession, whatever might be the consequences." *Mercury*, Dec. 12, 1850.

If there was any popular support of the Union at this time it centered in the region about Greenville and one of the Greenville representatives made an address on December 11, which has been preserved in the pamphlet, *Speech of Hon. B. F. Perry . . . in the House of Representatives*, Charleston, 1851. In the course of it, p. 17, occurs this: "I regard the dissolution of the Union as the most fatal blow which slavery could receive. Nothing could gratify the abolitionists more, or tend more to the accomplishment of their wicked purposes. We now have the protection of a great and powerful nation at home and abroad. We should then have a weak and petty government, incapable of defending our rights against foreign aggressions, and the sympathy of the whole civilized world against us. Our slaves, instead of stealing off separate and alone, as they now do, would go off in gangs to the North, and the frontier States would, in a short time, be without slaves. Restoration, then, would be out of the question. Now the guarantees of the Federal Constitution afford some protection."

[23] *House Journal*, p. 103.

State". The test vote stood 109 for, against twelve opposed.[24] This bill put off the date of the proposed congress to January 2, 1852, and fixed the place of meeting at Montgomery. It also provided for the speedy election of delegates to a state convention but left the time of their assemblage entirely at the discretion of the legislature.[25] Very probably it was a partial victory for obstructionist tactics on the part of the coöperationists. It would seem that while they were not strong enough to pass a measure entirely their own, they were yet able to draw in enough doubtful votes to compel the secessionists to give way, in part, and by putting off the congress nearly a year, and the convention indefinitely, had kept their enemies from forcing the issue at a time when the popular mind was excessively sensitive.[26]

They were less successful in the more immediate matter of the senatorship. But again they were able to block the extremists of the opposite party. On November 27 resolutions were submitted pledging the legislature not to elect a senator. Nevertheless, on December 17, the Houses proceeded to ballot for the office. That a real contest ensued is evinced by the fact that four ballots proved necessary to a choice. Rhett was elected by ninety-seven votes out of a total of 167. Thus one great victory, at least, stood clearly to the credit of the secessionists.[27]

The motives behind the next move in the game are conjectural. It was made by the coöperationists—or, at least, by that Southern Rights Association in which the coöperationists seem always to have had a majority. From Charleston went out an invitation to a state convention of associations to meet in Charleston the first Monday in May.[28] After some discussion of time and place the invitation was

[24] The minority included several coöperationists from Charleston who had voted with the rest of their group, previously, in support of resolutions introduced by Memminger postponing the whole matter to the next session of the legislature. *House Journal*, p. 180. But though Memminger voted for the compromise, these extremists would not. Very probably also the compromise had the support of all the few Unionists. Three of the four Greenville representatives voted for it. It was said afterward that these were the only Unionists in the legislature. B. F. Perry, *Reminiscences*, p. 13.

[25] *House Journal*, pp. 214–216.

[26] The bill provided for the election of eighteen deputies, four by the legislature, two by popular vote in each Congressional district. The popular elections were fixed for the second Monday in October.

[27] *House Journal*, pp. 46, 225.

[28] It was stated subsequently that Rhett had nothing to do with the calling of the convention. *Mercury*, May 19, 1851. The inspiration of it was said to be the similar convention recently held in Alabama. According to the *Mercury* of February 14, 1851, the invitation was dated January 17. In a pamphlet, *South Carolina in 1850, Tracts for the People, No. 2*, the letter of invitation is printed under date of January 22.

generally accepted and the various associations prepared to elect delegates.[29]

And now the Rhett following moved out for a pitched battle to make good its apparent gains in the legislature in December. The preliminary skirmish took place in the Charleston association, April 7, over the election of delegates to the coming convention. A speech which Rhett made focuses the overlooked issue which is the real clew to the whole event. By the spring of 1851 many secessionists had become afraid that the angers of 1850 were evaporating. The movements for secession in Georgia and Mississippi were still under way, but the hope that they would come to something was beginning to wane. A new fear was testing secessionists and separating those who thought in terms of the South as a whole from those who did not. This fear put the scheme for a Southern congress in its final setting. Men like Butler, much as they wanted to secede, were still for a Southern congress and for allowing the South as a whole to decide the matter. Men like Rhett were for a congress only as a device for reënforcing their own position. They went still further. Now that they were beginning to be afraid that general Southern sentiment was turning against them, they were for setting that sentiment at defiance. But they were too canny to do so in a flagrant way if they could get their end by strategy. A conclusion was inescapable. Rhett redefined the issue; his new definition of it continued to be the real issue to the end of the episode. He would not submit secession to the judgment of the whole South. Therefore, he nailed his colors, declaring there should not be a general Southern convention. To discredit the scheme in every possible way was his obvious policy. His speech redefining the issue, and giving his followers their final program, was addressed to the Charleston association at the election of delegates. "A Southern Congress now", he said, "would be our ruin. . . . It would counsel submission." He saw no alternative

[29] One of the confusing features of the episode is its crisscross of elections of delegates. In the course of 1851, there were three. This choice of delegates to the convention of associations; an earlier election of delegates to the state convention provided for by the bill of December; a later one, for deputies to the congress. The elections for the state convention were held in February and singularly enough aroused no interest. The candidates do not seem to have committed themselves on the great question of the moment. In Charleston only 873 votes were cast. *Mercury*, Feb. 7, 1851. In the election of the following October, the vote in Charleston numbered 3847. *Courier*, Oct. 16, 1851. And yet it was this group of delegates who, more than a year later, were at last called together and cast the final vote of the state. It seems that they accepted the election of October, 1851—ostensibly the choice of deputies to the proposed Southern congress—as an authoritative pronouncement of the state's policy. See note 46.

but "submission or secession by South Carolina alone". For the latter course he had three main arguments: the temperamental one, the pride of a fearless nature that disdained to count the costs in a dispute about its right; the diplomatic argument, which amounted to this, that when the other Southern states should have to choose between seceding and remaining in the Union with one great slave state left out, their sense of self-preservation would force them to take sides with the seceder, whether they wished to do so or not; the commercial argument, according to which South Carolina might deflect all Southern trade from the North by opposing to the Federal duties averaging thirty per cent., local duties of ten per cent. or less.[30]

A subsequent quarrel in the Charleston association led to a newspaper discussion of this meeting of April 7.[31] The coöperationists in

[30] The speech is printed in full in the *Mercury*, Apr. 8, 1851. The commercial argument, attacked by Butler in his speech before the convention the next month, was discussed, first and last, at great length in newspaper articles and pamphlets. Examples:

Courier, May 3, 1851: letter signed "Utter Ruin".

The Southern States, Their Present Peril, and their Certain Remedy, Charleston, 1850.

The Rightful Remedy. By Edward B. Bryan, Charleston, 1850.

State Secession. Tracts for the Times, No. 2.

Resources of South Carolina. Tracts for the People, No. 5.

The Union, Past and Future: How it Works and How to Save It. By a Citizen of Virginia. Charleston. 1850.

The Position and Course of the South. By Wm. H. Trescott. Charleston. 1850.

Separate State Secession Practically Discussed, in a Series of Articles, Published Originally in the Edgefield Advertiser. By Rutledge, Edgefield, 1851. This confident secessionist pamphlet was answered by a series of editorials in the Charleston *Evening News* which were reprinted as a pamphlet, *Southern Rights and Co-operation Documents. The "Rutledge" Pamphlet reviewed.*

These pamphlets among them contained a great many figures upon the exports and imports of Charleston. The coöperation pamphlets, representing the Charleston influence, show as might be expected the better understanding of finance. To illustrate: "Rutledge" knows it all in this connection, while the reviewer of Rutledge admits, p. 10: "It is one of the most difficult calculations, in the whole range of this complicated investigation, to arrive at the amount of foreign goods consumed in South Carolina, as the basis of an estimate of the annual sum in duty she pays under the present Tariff. We have supposed that $4 per head round, as the multiple of her population, would furnish the nearest approximate result. We find that the last annual Treasury Report gives an average for several years down to 1850 of about $5.40 per capita." The reviewer undertakes to show that "Rutledge" has failed to take account of several factors in the evidence and concludes that a proper view of the matter "would make the annual contribution of this State to the Treasury of the Union, on account of the Tariff, $4,450,000 per annum. Rutledge makes the amount $4,000,000".

One effect of the discussion was to lead the *Mercury* to shift its position from low tariff to "absolutely free trade".

[31] Letters on both sides appeared in the papers in July; especially a letter from "Member of the old Association", *Mercury*, July 25.

the Association were confronted, according to these confidences made to the public afterward, by "a new test", the test of belief in immediate secession as credentials of good standing in a Southern Rights Association. In Charleston, however, the test was rejected. Rhett failed to capture the Association of St. Philip and St. Michael.

In the interior of the state he was more successful. When the convention met, May 5, his following among the members was very strong. His kinsman, Edmund Rhett, promptly submitted resolutions urging the legislature to assemble that convention of the state provided for by the act of December, 1850, with a view to "declaring South Carolina an independent State".[32] These, with other resolutions, were referred to a select committee of twenty-one by which was brought in a majority report favoring the Rhett position and a minority report taking the opposite view. The coöperationists' report was "rejected by an overwhelming majority"; the secession report

[32] *Proceedings of the Meeting of Delegates from the Southern Rights Associations of South Carolina. Held at Charleston, May, 1851.* Columbia, 1851. P. 7. Practically the entire proceedings are also in the Charleston papers. The key to the Rhett policy is in the third of the resolutions mentioned above: "That the only effective call upon the South must be by the appeal of a practical issue." Among the various utterances preceding the convention to which this may be taken as a retort should be included a letter from Bishop William Capers published in the *Mercury* and other papers, Feb. 7, 1851, in which he says: "To secede . . . alone must be to secede from the other Southern States no less than from the Northern." This and other clerical utterances called forth a pamphlet, *Our Mission: Is it to be accomplished by the perpetuation of our present Union? The question considered by the light of Revealed religion,* Charleston, 1851.

The position taken by the secessionists in the convention was, naturally, that taken by their leader in his speech of April 7. The coöperationists had had time to prepare themselves to meet his argument. One of the great shots which they fired at this time was a letter from Cheves read before the convention. He took the same position he had taken at Nashville. "The object of the Convention I understand to be, to declare whether, in the opinion of the Convention, South Carolina ought to secede from the Union alone, and without the concurrent action of any other of the Southern States . . . one State of the South cannot stand alone in the midst of her sister States . . . we are but one member of this large family [the South] and have no right to dictate authoritatively to the other members of the family. We must wait upon them, and entreat them to move." *Proceedings,* pp. 8–9. Barnwell, who spoke in the same vein, afterward recovered the substance of his extemporaneous remarks in a pamphlet, *Southern Rights and Co-operation Documents, No. 2,* which is fairly represented by this very "modern" passage: "I repeat it again, Mr. President, that we entirely underestimate the power of national sentiment, when we sever ourselves from the other slaveholding States. Patriotism has its negative as well as its positive pole, and its repulsion is proportionate to its attraction. You cannot be out of the Union, and yet maintain unbroken the ties of sympathy and of party, which now join us in close connection with so many generous, faithful, and truehearted friends within our Southern border. They cannot sustain themselves at home, and hold strict alliance with a State which has become to them a foreign nation."

was adopted, resolution by resolution, by sweeping majorities.[33] An "Address . . . to the Southern Rights Associations of other Southern States" was adopted and in it were these significant words: "We have come to the deliberate conclusion, that if it be our fate to be left alone in the struggle, alone we must vindicate our liberty by secession."[34]

Again the Rhett following appeared to have won the day. But the race is not always to the swift and the downfall of the Rhetts, in this episode, dates from their apparent triumph. In setting themselves squarely against the idea that the South as a whole should determine Southern policy, they were antagonizing a much more powerful force than they were aware. Hypnotized as they were by an older point of view—the point of view of 1830, of state rights men for whom the idea of a nationalized South had not yet crossed the horizon—they were merely puzzled by the position of their enemies.

The most interesting single event of the convention, from the point of view of the modern student, is the speech of Butler supporting the minority report on resolutions.[35] It was an answer to Rhett's speech of April 7, and became the foundation, practically, of all subsequent reasoning by the coöperationists. In the course of an argument that in tone and method is singularly "modern" he points out that the policy of the opposing faction amounts to a coercion of the rest of the Southern states through their economic and emotional interests. He makes the bold statement that no public man in South Carolina, foreseeing the economic consequences of secession, would "put the State on the trial of that experiment" if he did not believe that the other Southern states would be forced by circumstances to come to her aid. He charges his opponents with aiming to place those states "in such circumstances that having a common destiny they would be compelled to be involved in a common sacrifice". He protests: ". . . to force a Sovereign State to take a position against its consent is to make of it a reluctant associate. . . . Both interest and honor must require the Southern States to take council together. . . ."

Shortly after the convention rose, Armistead Burt, one of the

[33] *Proceedings*, pp. 12, 18, 20. The minority report was signed by W. P. Finley and P. Della Torre, the Charleston member of the committee, and by James Chestnut, jr., the member from Kershaw.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 17. The Address was adopted "with but one dissenting voice". *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[35] Printed in full in the *Mercury*, May 17, 1851. The *Mercury* dissents editorially but "not in a spirit alien to respect" and still holds that trade would be benefited by secession "even though it should result in creating an impassable gulf around our whole Northern and Western borders and the merchants of South Carolina were left to a simple monopoly of the trade of her own people . . .".

Carolina representatives at Washington, published a letter in which he said:

> I have taken much pains to ascertain whether if South Carolina secedes, she will be sustained by the act or the public opinion of any other State. The result is a conviction that our example would not be followed, nor our conduct justified by any of them. They evidently do not regard the past or the present state of things as justifying Secession. And I fear they believe that South Carolina from factious or selfish motives is endeavoring to involve them in a contest without cause, and would look upon a struggle between the General Government and this State without concern and without sympathy.[36]

The arguments of the opposing sides were thus indicated. And then began a war of words in newspapers, speeches, and pamphlets. The literature of the movement is voluminous, and though it sometimes degenerates into mere bitterness, it is oftener dignified, and in its best examples very able.[37] Through these clouds of rancor, one fact emerges gradually into clear light. Charleston is the soul of the resistance to immediate secession.[38] It is in Charleston, apparently,

[36] *Mercury*, May 24, 1851. By way of counteracting such remarks the *Mercury* printed many passages from other Southern papers and correspondence from other states such as the resolution of the second meeting of the Alabama convention of Southern Rights Association that in case another state seceded "it would become the duty of this State, as of all the other States, to oppose with force any attempt upon the part of the General Government to coerce such seceding State". *Ibid.*, June 16. From a convention of the Southern Rights party of Bulloch and Scriven counties, Georgia, came resolutions to the effect that in case it is attempted to coerce South Carolina, we "will rally to the rescue with our rifles and fight to the death". *Ibid.*, June 24.

[37] The three Charleston newspapers—the *Mercury*, the *Courier*, and the *News*—were joined by a fourth, the *Southern Standard*, which became the avowed organ of the coöperationists. The *Mercury*, on the whole, in spite of its frank partisanship, is the most useful of the four to the student. I do not know whether there has ever been an accurate poll of the newspapers throughout the state as to what side they took in 1851. B. F. Perry, one of the three Greenville Unionists mentioned in note 23, claims that when in 1851 he "started the *Southern Patriot*" at Greenville, it was done "amidst the terrible excitement and storm of secession, which had swept every Union paper out of existence in South Carolina . . .". *Reminiscences of Public Men*, p. 257. Perhaps the accuracy of the statement turns on just what he means by "Union". But there seems to be little doubt that at the height of the movement, the press of the state was generally secessionist outside Charleston.

Of the pamphlets, many are extremely interesting; some very valuable as historical material; and one, at least, the entertaining *Letters of Curtius*, comes near to being literature.

[38] This slips out in the admissions of the secessionists. "We are amazed at the opposition, especially among the merchants of Charleston, to Secession." *Mercury*, June 4, 1851. Rhett, speaking on June 28, 1851 (see note 24), is thus reported in the *Mercury* of July 7: "It had gone abroad, he understood that Charleston was for submission. He did not believe it. . . . Money may paralyze

that the turning point of the episode is to be found. The event was the refusal of the officers of the Southern Rights Association of St. Philip and St. Michael to assemble the Association for its specified quarterly meeting, early in July. Thereupon those members who were secessionists met and organized an "Auxiliary Southern Rights Association".[39] The chairman of the meeting which formed the new organization threw significant light on the state of things in Charleston by congratulating his associates upon the awakening of their faction from a "condition of torpor" which they must now show was "not the sleep of the dead, but the trance of the living".

The full significance of this meeting is revealed in the resolutions of another held shortly afterward. The coöperationist majority of St. Philip and St. Michael called a great public rally which assembled on a wild night of storm, July 29, and resolved, "That, inasmuch as The Auxiliary Southern Rights Association is now recognized as intended to advance the doctrine of separate State action"[40] it was incumbent on the coöperationists to rouse themselves to renewed activity. Butler was present and spoke in opposition to separate state secession. Barnwell did the same. A letter from Cheves was read. A set of resolutions[41] drew up the coöperation argument more ably

some and cowardice others but the proceedings of this day tell where the people will be in the hour of trial." The pamphlet *Behind and Before, or What is to be done? Tracts for the People, No. 8,* is a bitter attack upon Charleston for its opposition to separate secession. The same purpose underlies No. 7 of the same series, the pamphlet entitled *Secession First—Co-operation After.* In addition there are the many ballotings in which the Charleston vote is the constant factor around which coöperation rallies.

[39] *Mercury,* July 22, 24; *Courier,* July 24. The newspaper letters discussing this event brought out the facts referred to in note 31.

[40] The proceedings are given in full, except for the text of speeches in a pamphlet, *Southern Rights Documents. Co-operation Meeting, Held in Charleston, S. C., July 29, 1851.* This pamphlet also contains a list of "upwards of *Twelve Hundred Signatures*" which had been appended to the call for the meeting. The statement is made that had time permitted the number could easily have been increased to 2000 names. The final poll of the party in Charleston was 2479. See note 48.

[41] *Ibid.,* pp. 13–16. The fourth resolution is their last word in the way of summing up their attitude to the time: "That in the present aspect of our political affairs, we deprecate the separate secession of South-Carolina from the Union: 1st. Because it is due to our Southern confederates having a common interest and threatened by a common danger, to take counsel with them, and especially with such of their citizens as are known to be our faithful and devoted friends, as to the mode and measures of redress for our common wrongs; and because our precipitate secession from the Union, in opposition to their views and wishes, would seem as if we claimed to be the exclusive champions of Southern Rights—an assumption which could not but be regarded as arrogant in us, and insulting to them—thus, in place of harmony of feeling, and concert of action, provoking jealousies, and sowing the seeds of discord between us and our natural allies,

than anywhere else except in Butler's speech before the convention of associations.

Under the provisions of the Southern Congress Act, the election for deputies was to take place the second Monday in October.[42] The two months intervening between the meeting of July 29 and the election form the last round in the duel between the two brands of state rights men. Unless we bear this fact in mind the real significance of the election will be lost. It must be remembered that when the campaign opened neither Georgia nor Mississippi had taken a final stand. Nor was there as yet a prevailing conviction upon the attitude of the Upper South. A general Southern congress and a genuine sectional deliberation upon the issue of secession was not yet an impossibility. But before the two months were over, a situation had developed that is quite incomprehensible, unless it is seen in the perspective that has here been drawn. Though, on the face of the returns, it was a choice of delegates to a congress, the election was in point of fact something quite different. And it was not what hasty observation has concluded it was, not merely the last gun in the controversy over giving the Union another trial. In this election South Carolina did not say that it had decided not to secede. What it did say was that it was fearful lest premature action might have the re-

and operating to prevent the formation of a Southern Confederacy. 2d. Because our separate secession would be eminently premature and unwise at this time, when we may fairly calculate on the co-operation of other States at no distant period, since the effect of renewed agitation and continued aggression by Northern fanatics—results which may be regarded as absolutely certain, must inevitably be, to bring up some of our sister States of the South to the same position which we now occupy, and thus operate to ensure the formation of a Southern Confederacy. 3. Because South-Carolina, by separate secession, would be placed in the attitude of a Foreign Government to the other slave-holding States of this Union, the effect of which would be, that, under the laws of Congress, prohibiting the migration or importation of slaves from a foreign country into the United States, we should be subjected practically to the 'Wilmot Proviso', in its most aggravated form. 4th. Because in all her public resolves, South-Carolina has given no other pledge—has avowed no other determination, than to co-operate with her sister States of the South in resisting these aggressions; and, Finally, Because in the present posture of affairs, to dissolve our Union with the South, and thus isolate ourselves from the sympathies and support of those with whom we are bound together in a common destiny, would be not only abortive as a measure of deliverance, but if not utterly suicidal in its effects, in the highest degree dangerous to our Institutions."

In a sort of appendix is printed the long letter from Cobb's opponent, McDonald, the Southern Rights candidate for governor of Georgia, who had been invited to attend the meeting. He says: "You cannot expect . . . the co-operation of Georgia, in any measure of resistance, against the past measures of Congress. . . . Whether any other Southern State would unite with you in seceding from the Union, I do not know. I think it extremely improbable" (p. 18).

[42] See note 26.

sult of "sowing the seeds of discord between us and our natural allies, and operating to prevent the forming of a Southern Confederacy". In other words, the election was a plebiscite on the question whether the old idea of the separate independent state should prevail over the new idea of the social unity of the South.

As the result showed, the meeting of July 29 was the beginning of the end. Charleston, once more, laid its strong hand upon the rest of the state and directed the course of events. After the fight had been lost by the Rhetts, the *Mercury* said: ". . . This result causes us no surprise, and it will cause none in the State at large. The indications were too distinct that the controlling interests of trade had thrown their decisive influence against the separate action of the State. . . ."[43]

This is an extremely interesting side light, and will some day form the point of departure for a more elaborate study of the relations of Southern trade to Southern nationalism than has yet been made. But, on the lips of the Rhett faction, it is a cry of disdain rather than an historical judgment. Why Charleston in 1851 should have become a seat of Southern nationalism is not an easy question to answer. A very plausible argument will derive the all-Southern consciousness from the Southern West, from the reactions of the frontier, especially from the state of Mississippi. And yet it is hard to say which led and which followed—Mississippi or Charleston—in the movement for Southern unity in 1851.

These two months of the last stage of the battle are the period of decision in those other states each of which also held a plebiscite on secession but where the terms of the plebiscite were quite different from the South Carolina terms. In these months secession was defeated in Mississippi and in Georgia. Why, is not, as yet, quite clear. The one remaining crux for the biographers of Jefferson Davis is the question, just what he was driving at when he relieved Quitman and took Quitman's place in the losing Democratic fight for the governorship of Mississippi. Toombs and others who won the day in Georgia seem to have had no definite views on the issue of Southern nationalism, but this is a point that should be referred to Professor Phillips. Of one thing we may be certain. The South Carolinians, except for a very small group, were not actuated by a belief that it was good policy to give the Union another trial—the belief, it seems to me, that animated the victorious Georgians. Their movement differs from those others in being actuated through and through by a belief in secession; but it split upon this far more subtle issue, the recognition

[43] Oct. 15, 1851.

of the whole South as having become a single community—upon Southern nationalism.

To the last moment the Rhett faction made a desperate fight. The *Mercury,* during the two fateful months, struggled bravely to discredit all those subtle reasonings which Butler understood so well, which had been phrased so ably in the resolutions of July 29. In its columns Butler is the constant object of attack.[44]

As the time of the elections for deputies to the Southern congress drew near, the coöperationists determined to make perfectly plain the ground on which they now stood. What may be looked upon as their official platform is contained in an "Address" ratified by a meeting in Charleston, September 23.[45] In this address it was proposed to make the coming election a clear expression of opinion for or against immediate secession. On this understanding deputies were nominated.[46] Meanwhile, the course of events in Georgia and Mississippi was watched closely and as the tide turned in those states the coöperationists made the most of it.[47] When, at last, the election was held, October 13 and 14, out of 42,760 votes, the coöperationists had a majority of 7334. In Charleston the vote for coöperation stood 2479 against 1463.[48]

The secessionists at once accepted the election as a defeat [49] and

[44] In this last stage, the controversy became bitter. One of the most singular details of it is a revival of the agitation with regard to the Federal garrison at Charleston. Indiscretions of the soldiers, and an addition to the garrison, fell in at a dramatic moment. In August, the *Mercury* printed a bitter editorial on "The Army of Occupation". Still more extreme things were printed in October. An editorial, October 10, implied that the Federal government intended to use both force and money to affect the election and was construed by prominent coöperationists as an insinuation that they were involved. The next day was published "A Card", signed by thirty names, demanding of the editors of the *Mercury* "the grounds upon which they had given currency to so foul an aspersion". The *Mercury* replied on the 11th denying that it had made any charge except that the Washington government had "*the desire* to intimidate and corrupt". The debate continued to the morning of election day, October 13.

[45] *Proceedings of the Great Southern Co-operation and Anti-Secession Meeting, Held in Charleston, September 23, 1851.* Charleston, 1851. (*Southern Rights and Co-operation Documents, No. 6.*)

[46] *Ibid.,* pp. 10–11. It seems to have been admitted, by this time, that the deputies might have nothing to do. The opportunity to vote for them was seized as a test of popular sentiment and as a mandate to the legislature. See note 29.

[47] See the ironic pamphlet, *Letters of Curtius,* Charleston, 1851, p. 44.

[48] *Courier,* Oct. 16, Nov. 1, 1851.

[49] In Charleston the Auxiliary Southern Rights Association resolved, October 27, that "Inasmuch as since our last meeting, the party to which we belong has been defeated in an election in which we had confidently expected a decided majority . . ." though the Association still believed in separate State action, it would discontinue meetings for the present, and leave it to "the successful party to devise or maintain measures to relieve the State from her position . . .". *Courier,* Oct. 29, 1851.

there can be no doubt that the delegates to the state convention interpreted it as a mandate. In the following April the long delayed convention met.[50] Among its earliest acts was the appointment of a committee of twenty-one to report generally on the policy of the state. A further evidence of the victory of Charleston in this episode seems to lie in the fact that eight of the twenty-one were members of the Charleston delegation. On the committee were the three preëminent Charleston leaders, Butler,[51] Cheves, and Barnwell. Cheves was chairman. An attempt to amend the report he submitted was the last stand of the secessionists. It was voted down 96 to 60. The report of the committee was then adopted by a vote of 136 to 19. That Rhett accepted his defeat in a lofty spirit is shown by the fact that he voted with the majority, and not with the nineteen irreconcilables, sustaining the resolutions which, after declaring that there was ample justification for "dissolving at once all political connection" between South Carolina and "her co-States", concluded "that she forbears the exercise of this manifest right of self-government from considerations of expediency only".[52]

[50] *Journal of the State Convention of South Carolina*, Columbia, 1852.

[51] A leader of the Charleston party, that is, though a resident of Edgefield. He was a member of the Charleston delegation.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 18. The final vote is misinterpreted by Mr. W. A. Schaper in his monograph, *Sectionalism in South Carolina*. Though ignoring the episode of 1851, he makes this incidental remark: "In a convention in 1852 the question of the right of secession came to a vote. There were 19 votes cast against the doctrine. . . ." Of the nineteen, eleven had previously voted with Rhett in support of the secession amendment to the report of the committee of twenty-one. *Ibid.*, p. 17. Curiously enough one of these was B. F. Perry, editor of the *Southern Weekly Patriot*, afterward provisional governor, who prided himself on his Unionism. His vote on the resolutions leads one to go slowly in drawing conclusions with regard to the more obscure events of the convention. Surely this minority was a case of strange bedfellows. Toomer, who was one of the nineteen, previously offered resolutions urging the organization of a Southern Confederacy. Of the eight, in the final nineteen, who had not voted with Rhett on resolutions, four comprised with Perry the Greenville delegation. Two of these, Duncan and Brockman, were among the Unionists mentioned in note 24. Edward McCrady, another of the eight, was a vice president at the coöperationist meeting of July 29. *Courier*, July 30. Though this does not account for all the votes of the nineteen, it is sufficient to halt the statement that "the question of the right of secession came to a vote" in 1852. The men of that day did not have, as a rule, an enthusiasm for the explicit in their phrases. The Southern men who talked of their "Unionism" seldom meant the same thing as Northern men who used identical phrases. For example, Perry, after South Carolina had seceded, told Governor Means: "You are all now going to the devil, and I will go with you. Honor and patriotism require me to stand by my State, right or wrong. And I acknowledge the great principle proclaimed in the Declaration of American Independence, that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish them, and institute

new governments." *Reminiscences of Public Men*, p. 16. The same idea is developed craftily in that speech of Clemens of Alabama, in the Senate. in which after declaring himself an ardent Unionist he yet reserves to his state, by implication, complete freedom of action through the doctrine of the "manly" right of revolution. *Congressional Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 sess., app., p. 95. The Northerners might have used identical language with a different significance. In all these confusions the undistributed middle term is "the people"—or its equivalent. The more one studies the middle century in South Carolina, the more one doubts the presence there in appreciable degree of what the North meant by Unionism.

Scripps College. N. W. STEPHENSON.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

I. Virginia and the Alien and Sedition Laws

A charge, unchallenged for more than a century, has rested against the state of Virginia. Its legislature has been accused of making provision for armed resistance to the enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Acts. The militia was reorganized and made more formidable, additional arms were purchased, an armory erected, and taxes laid, with the design, it is said, of making war upon the Federal government. This is tantamount to a charge of conspiracy. When one considers the impossibility of concealing official action and the necessity for profound secrecy, the statement challenges our credulity. Yet historians have accepted it. Thus Albert J. Beveridge in his *Life of John Marshall*: "the Republican spirit was running high. The Virginia legislature provided for an armory in Richmond to resist 'encroachments' of the National Government."[1] Madison and Jefferson, asserts Henry Adams, "were privy to the preparations making in Virginia for armed resistance; or if they were not, it was because they chose to be ignorant".[2]

These assertions rest, as far as documentary evidence is concerned, upon two contemporary letters and upon two statements made some time later by John Randolph and William B. Giles. Writing to Rufus King in November, 1799, Theodore Sedgwick, Massachusetts Federalist, declared that party faction had become so bitter that Virginia had displayed "an anxiety to render its militia as formidable as possible, and to supply its arsenals & magazines, and for those purposes it actually imposed a tax on its Citizens".[3] The other letter is from Alexander Hamilton, but he so obviously received his information from Sedgwick that it can have no value as evidence.[4]

John Randolph was naturally more colorful. At one time during the course of a debate in January, 1817, over a commercial bill, Cyrus

[1] Vol. II., p. 406.

[2] *John Randolph*, p. 27. See also Hermann von Holst, *Constitutional History of the United States*, I. 158: "It was a well-known fact that at the time that Washington saw a 'dreadful crisis hastening', a large establishment for the manufacture of arms was set up in Richmond. . . ."

[3] *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, ed. Charles King, III. 147 f.

[4] Hamilton's letter paraphrases Sedgwick's: "It is stated . . . that the opposition party in Virginia . . . have taken measures to put their militia on a more efficient footing—are preparing considerable arsenals and magazines, and . . . have gone so far as to lay new taxes on their citizens." *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, ed. J. C. Hamilton, VI. 384.

King, of Massachusetts, threw in the face of his Virginia opponents a statement made previously on the floor of the House concerning an armory established in Richmond to resist the Federal government. John Jackson rose to defend his state, but was interrupted by Randolph, who, recognizing himself as the author of the remarks referred to, wished to explain what he had actually said. The statement, he declared, had been made in a debate over a constitutional amendment abridging the rights of the states, and was to the effect that:

> By the timely and judicious exercise of the very right proposed to be taken away, this Union had been saved from incalculable mischief and misery. That by throwing . . . her whole weight into the electoral scale, the Commonwealth of Virginia had constitutionally effected a change of ministry, and checked the mad career of ambition and usurpation, which otherwise she might have been compelled to resist at the hazard . . . of a civil war, for there was no longer any cause for concealing the fact, that the grand armory at Richmond was built to enable the State of Virginia to resist, by force, the encroachments of the then Administration upon her indisputable rights . . . in case they should persevere in these outrageous proceedings.[5]

This assertion he then proceeded to amplify and explain. His charges, when stripped of the verbiage for which he was famous, amount simply to this: when running for Congress in 1799 he was asked if he justified the establishment of the armory to resist the government, and he replied that he did. He could defend Virginia, he said, because party feeling ran highest in 1798–1799, and in the halls of Congress the Federalists were even suggesting the partition of the state, for they thought she had grown so large as to be unmanageable. With the knife at her throat, any measures were justifiable, and the members of the assembly knew that "logic was no match for the bayonet, and they provided bayonets . . .". The armory at Richmond, fathered by John Taylor of Caroline, he asserted, was designed to supply these and other weapons.

Randolph's charges were challenged by two of the Virginia repre-

[5] I have never been able to find the exact date on which Randolph first made this statement. All indications point to its having been made in December, 1816. Between 1799 and 1817 only two amendments which could have had the effect he intimated aroused his determined opposition. One was proposed in the session of 1812–1813, the other in 1816. The character of Randolph's remarks in the debate over the second mentioned amendment is thoroughly in keeping with a statement like the one under discussion. See *Annals of Congress*, 14 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 322 ff. Furthermore, Mr. King was not a member of Congress in 1812, and the matter was fresh in the minds of all participants in the dispute in 1817. Jackson does not seem to have been present when the remarks were first made, and seems to be taking the first opportunity of correcting them. The debates in January, 1817, may be found in the *Annals of Congress*, 14 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 793–806.

sentatives, John Jackson and James Pleasants, jr., both members of the assembly of 1798. The armory was built, declared Jackson, to insure an adequate supply of dependable guns, a need long felt by the state. Until that moment, he had never "heard a single individual intimate a disposition to oppose with arms the constituted authority of the Government".[6] Equally vigorous was Pleasants's denial. "It was a certain fact", he said, "that the men who had the principal agency in the establishment of that armory, had most unequivocally disavowed that intention." Mr. Taylor, he asserted, never expected the arms to be used in civil war. "He most emphatically did disclaim, as I do now, any such views."[7]

William B. Giles affords the final piece of evidence upon which to base the charge. In a speech before the Virginia legislature in 1825 he urged opposition to the tariff on the ground that Virginia had always vigorously defended her rights. When threatened in 1798, her leaders did not tamely submit, he declared:

> They . . . determined to arm the militia, and to make provision to purchase 5,000 stands of arms.—Then it was sir, that the foundation for the regular supply of arms to the militia was laid, in the establishment of your armory.—To defray the expenses of these measures, they raised the whole taxes of the State 25 per cent. . . .[8]

Charges such as these of Sedgwick, Randolph, and Giles are much easier made than sustained. Were it not for their plausibility, and were it not for the unfortunate fact that we rather like to believe such things, the accusations could not stand. Sedgwick was a leader of the Federalists in Congress, and would naturally be expected to misrepresent the acts of a Republican legislature. Randolph's powers of exaggeration are as well known as are his other eccentricities. The question asked him during the Congressional campaign may easily be discounted.[9] At such times there was always much loose talk, and

[6] He also declared that the governor had entered into a contract with James Swan of Boston for the purchase of arms, but these proving valueless upon delivery, it was necessary for the state to supply its own weapons. Randolph answered that the armory "was built, not so much because of the badness of the arms, as because it was proper for the State of Virginia to keep in her possession the means of arming the militia, rather than depend for her supply on contracts which the United States might stop". A more perfect refutation of Jackson's argument is simply that the guns were not delivered and found faulty until two years after the bill for the erection of the armory was passed. See below, note 16.

[7] In passing it is worth noting that subsequent writers do not mention the emphatic denial of the charges by participants in the actual events.

[8] William B. Giles, *Political Miscellanies* (Richmond, 1830), p. 146. There is also a statement in Samuel Mordecai, *Richmond in By-Gone Days* (Richmond, 1856), p. 202, but this is based only upon hearsay.

[9] See above, p. 337.

one would expect the question and answer to have been what they were. The political purpose behind both Randolph's and Giles's statements is perfectly apparent. While these facts do not constitute complete disproof of the charge, they naturally arouse suspicions of its truth.

Fortunately disproof of the charge can be based upon a surer foundation. A study of the pertinent features of Virginia administration, 1789–1798, the reorganization of the militia, the purchase of arms, and the increase of taxes, leads inevitably to the conclusion that the measures taken in 1798 were not new. They were part of a consistent policy undertaken before the Alien and Sedition Acts were passed, even before they could reasonably have been expected, and had nothing to do with opposition to them.

That part of the charge relating to the militia rests upon the weakest of foundations. In 1792 Congress enacted a general militia law, which provided that each state should regulate its own militia. Pursuant to this act, the Virginia legislature passed a law organizing the state troops, and in 1793 the act was amended, but even as amended it did not provide for an efficient system.[10] There was little coördination between the various units, and it was found difficult to obtain united and speedy action. In 1795 all previous acts were reduced to one, and in 1799 another attempt was made to secure greater efficiency. By the act of that year the governor was given authority to divide or consolidate regiments as the occasion might demand.[11] It was this failure to provide earlier for centralized control that had made the previous system inefficient.

No more substantial evidence of the charge may be found in the matter of arms for the militia. If it was to be efficient, an adequate supply of dependable guns was a necessity and this the state did not have. Ample evidence testifies to the lack of arms and to the poor quality of such as were obtainable. Even the weapons in the arsenal at Point of Fork were badly in need of repair, and the supply there was deemed insufficient. With this condition in mind the legislature in 1796 authorized the governor to procure additional arms.[12] In September, 1796, the governor's agent reported that guns could be purchased abroad through James Swan of Boston, and after some correspondence a contract was agreed upon in May, 1797. For the

[10] *Statutes at Large of Virginia*, Hening, XIII. 340. See especially the letter of Arthur Campbell to the governor, *Calendar of Virginia State Papers* (W. P. Palmer *et al.*, eds.), VII. 271 ff. (Hereinafter referred to as *C.S.P.*) Also, *ibid.*, pp. 113 ff.

[11] *Statutes at Large of Virginia*, Shepherd, I. 341; II. 141.

[12] *C.S.P.*, VII. 309. See also V. 601; VII. 341 f.; VIII. 489, 497. Shepherd, I. 365; II. 70.

storage of these guns—twenty thousand, deliverable four thousand a year for five years—two arsenals were provided by legislative act of January 23, 1798, and the same bill authorized the erection of an armory at Richmond.[13] An armory had been suggested as early as February, 1797, and a few months later the governor commissioned John Clarke to select a site. He was also to buy arms from some of the other states, which he failed to do, and to visit other armories. His report was presented in December, 1797, and a month later the bill for the erection of the armory was passed.[14]

The charge that the people of Virginia were taxed to support a probable war with the Federal government has no more substantial foundation than the others. Taxes were raised, it is perfectly true. The real dispute over the purchase of arms and the erection of the armory concerned the matter of expense, and not the purpose for which they were to be used.[15] The additional revenues, first provided in December, 1797, were to meet the additional burdens of the arms and the armory; the purpose of the one was the purpose of the other.

It merely remains to show that there could have been no possible connection between the measures taken by Virginia in 1798 and the Alien and Sedition Laws.

In the first place, it is quite clear that there were good reasons for an efficient, well-armed militia. During the first half of the 'nineties the danger from the Indians was real, and the militia was practically the only defense the state had. After 1793 the waters of the Atlantic swarmed with French and English privateers, and the coast of Virginia was exposed to attack in the event of war with either nation. The fear of these privateers was apparent; the fact that no ravaging vessels appeared does not vitiate the force of this argument. The thought was as powerful as the fact. Thus in 1793 the governor issued instructions to the militia, outlining their duties in the event any hostile vessels came into Virginia waters.[16] The danger was no less real in 1798, and the governor was besieged with petitions for arms. In July of that year Thomas Nelson wrote repeating a request he had made in 1794 for arms for his militia company: "The exposed situ-

[13] *C.S.P.*, VIII. 388, 389, 435 f. Also, *ibid.*, 419, 447. These guns were delivered in 1800 and found faulty. See *ibid.*, IX. 87, 101; and Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1896, I. 824–830. Shepherd, I. 87.

[14] See the letter of James Penn to the governor, Feb. 20, 1797. *C.S.P.*, VIII. 420, 455, 466, 468.

[15] The rate was increased between 1796 and 1798 from 25 cents on land and 28 on slaves to 48 and 44 respectively. Shepherd, II. 14, 73, 144. See also The John Taylor Correspondence, *The John P. Branch Historical Papers*, II. 280.

[16] *C.S.P.*, VI. 671 f. See also *ibid.*, VII. 236 f.

ation of this part of the country to depredation and injury from piratical marauders on account of its contiguity and openness to the sea, at that time was, as it now is, and must be, the cause and apology for this application. . . ." [17]

It is interesting to note in this connection how a later historian has misrepresented the evidence relating to the necessity for arms. Henry Adams, in commenting upon the political career of William B. Giles, refers to his extreme Republicanism in 1798. Illustrating his point by quotations from the report of Giles's speech in favor of the Resolutions of 1798, he makes the following statement: [18] "In language perfectly intelligible to his friends he hinted that his party 'had no arms, but they would find arms'." What Giles is actually reported to have said was that:

> The critical situation of the United States, too, had been mentioned: that France and England both had a view towards us; and that therefore great caution should be used. . . . He then expressed his disapprobation of the measures adopted by the government respecting the army and navy. He asked of what characters would they be composed? Of the idle and dissipated part of the community? On the contrary, who were the patriots who would protect their country? This very party mentioned by the President would repel any invasion. It was true they had no arms, but they would find arms.[19]

It was this threatening situation—an impending war, the danger from privateers, and the lack of arms—together with the inability to purchase arms in the United States that created the demand for the armory. Even though the contract had been let for a supply of arms, it was not at all certain that these would be delivered. Swan himself wrote the governor asking for an extension of time on his contract, and James Dawson, commissioned to buy guns in America, reported failure.[20]

In the second place, had there existed in the state a real determination to oppose by force the Federal administration, such intent would surely have been brought to light in the debates over the adoption of the Resolutions of 1798. But no definite accusations of this nature were made.[21] It was said, of course, that the adoption of the Resolu-

[17] *Ibid.*, VIII. 511.

[18] *History of the United States*, I. 285. I appreciate the force of the words "in language perfectly intelligible to his friends" by which Mr. Adams guards himself. Yet that Giles's friends interpreted the speech as does Mr. Adams is surely only a matter of opinion.

[19] *The Virginia Report of 1799–1800 . . . The Debate and Proceedings thereon in the House of Delegates of Virginia . . .* (Richmond, 1850), pp. 145 ff.

[20] *C.S.P.*, VIII. 485. See also *ibid.*, 386–388, 468.

[21] Pleasants stated in 1817 that General Lee had charged John Taylor with such intent. This does not appear in the recorded debates, but as the report is not verbatim, the question can not be determined.

tions would inflame the public mind, and might lead to open resistance. George K. Taylor, the most able opponent of the program, felt that by it "the people were encouraged most openly to make resistance",[22] and General Lee declared that the Resolutions struck him "as recommending resistance. They declared the laws null and void. Our citizens thus thinking, would disobey the laws. This disobedience would be patronised by the state, and could not be submitted to by the United States. Insurrection would be the consequence".[23] These are all general charges against the theory of the Resolutions, and of the danger of arousing public sentiment; they are not charges that preparations for war were being planned. It is perfectly natural that the Federalists should have made such charges. What is unnatural is that they should have overlooked the tremendous possibilities of an attack on the Republicans on the score of the armory and the militia, if there had been even the slightest doubt as to the purpose for which they were to be used. Attacks so general as those of the Federalists were easily met. The Republicans united with John Mercer in declaring that there was nothing more behind the Resolutions than an appeal to public opinion: "Force was not thought of by any one. The preservation of the federal Constitution, the cement of the Union with its original powers, was the object of the resolutions."[24]

And finally, there could have been no possible connection between the acts under discussion and the Alien and Sedition Laws, because the acts of the Virginia legislature had been under discussion for some years before 1798, and were actually passed several months before the Alien and Sedition Acts. The Alien Act was first introduced in the Senate on April 25, 1798, and passed both Houses on June 22. The Sedition Act did not come up in the Senate until June 26, and was not passed until July 10, 1798.[25] The reorganization of the militia was a problem in 1793, the purchase of arms was taken up in 1796, and plans for the armory were made in 1797. When the acts concerning the arms and the armory were before the Virginia legislature, in December and January, 1797–1798, the Alien and Sedition Acts were not before either House of Congress, and could not have been foreseen at so early a date.

In view of these facts, it can not be maintained that the militia was reorganized, arms purchased, an armory established, and taxes laid, to support a war against the Federal government.

Agnes Scott College. PHILIP G. DAVIDSON.

[22] *The Virginia Report of 1799–1800*, p. 30.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[25] *Annals of Congress*, 5 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 548, 575, 586, 589 f., 599, 609, 2028, 2093, 2171.

2. Anglo-Russian Negotiations about a "Permanent" Quadruple Alliance, 1840–1841

Late in 1840, after the most serious stage in the crisis of 1839–1841 over Levantine affairs had passed, Czar Nicholas I. found occasion in an interview with Lord Clanricarde, the British ambassador at St. Petersburg, to profess "the warmest feelings of friendship for England", to express the "most lively satisfaction" with the outcome of events in the East, and to reveal a "great desire" that the concord established through the treaty of July 15, 1840, between the four powers—Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia—should be cemented and preserved by every possible means.[1] Moreover Nicholas asked the British ambassador if Great Britain would

> object to record and establish by some act the alliance which . . . happily existed between the four Powers to serve as a security against any efforts that France might make to awaken revolutionary feelings in Europe, or against, perhaps, a revolutionary war. He [the czar] said that unfortunately the state of things, and the solemn act agreed upon and established in 1814 and 15, in which England and the Duke of Wellington had played so great a part in the international councils, as well as in the field, had been broken up and destroyed, and that no stable or solid settlement of Europe had been substituted for it; and that this was, in his opinion, the moment for some such arrangement. In short His Imperial Majesty proposed to me [Clanricarde] the Holy Alliance. And I must confess to Your Lordship [Palmerston] that I was embarrassed by the proposal. Knowing, as I do, the efforts that were made by the French Government to draw nearer to Russia, before, and during the commencement of my residence at this Court [of St. Petersburg], and feeling how important it is that the Emperor should continue to look upon England as not only the most powerful but also as the most trustworthy ally that he can have, I dared not to explain to His Majesty how repugnant to myself, and in my opinion to my countrymen and to my Government, would be any league formed for the repression of any opinions or principles whatever.[2]

In reply to the czar's advances Clanricarde stated that the "intentions" of an alliance of the four powers would be misinterpreted and that it would probably awaken the "very feelings" which its sponsor wished to repress. Also the British ambassador maintained that he did not see how a determination to oppose any "attempts at excitement or propagandism by foreigners" could be recorded without trenching on those principles of constitutional liberty to which the English were so much attached. The czar said he did not require a treaty; a clear understanding—an "assurance of Ambassadors"—would suffice. He asked what the British would do if France

[1] F. O. 65/262, no. 74, Clanricarde to Palmerston, Dec. 22, 1840.

[2] F. O. 65/262, no. 76, Clanricarde to Palmerston, "Confidential", Dec. 22, 1840.

attempted a revolutionary movement in Europe. Would they stand by the German governments? He declared with exultation that Thiers "had made Germany unanimous in hostility to French principles, and upon the conduct to be adopted in the event of a French army crossing the Rhine"—something which Metternich had in vain attempted to do for twenty-five years—but Nicholas let fall some observations on the government of Austria which revealed that he considered it to be "rather insecure". Likewise he let it be understood that he apprehended France might "very likely" go to war in the next spring or summer unless it was certain that Great Britain would in that case unite with the Northern powers. With British support he was certain of peace, or victory, although neither his treasury nor his army was prepared for war. Despite the urgent appeals of the czar, Clanricarde insisted that he could not give positive assurance as to what Great Britain would do if a new crisis arose in Europe.

Nesselrode as well as the czar discussed with Clanricarde the prospects of a permanent alliance for the maintenance of peace in Europe by the four powers whose representatives had signed the treaty of July 15, 1840, and early in January, 1841, he forwarded to Brunnow a long dispatch directing that such an alliance should be suggested formally to Palmerston. In this dispatch it was stated that the successors of Thiers in the French government had declared openly for "la *paix armée*". Guizot's intentions no doubt were pacific but his régime might at any time be succeeded by a government "plus docile aux instincts et aux animosités populaires". It did not seem absolutely necessary that a continuation of the union of the four powers should be based on a formal agreement. What was desired was the assurance that the accord of the four would survive the settlement of the Oriental question and that if France attacked her neighbors in violation of treaties Great Britain would unite with the other three powers to preserve the status quo.[3]

According to Clanricarde's opinion there was a difference between the language of Nesselrode and that of the czar. The latter spoke of an alliance of a very general nature which would be directed against revolutionary principles while the chancellor confined his proposals to the case of a French invasion of Germany for revenge or for the amelioration of the position in which France had been placed by the convention of the four powers. It was understood that Metternich had received coldly the czar's plan to make advances to Great Britain and that Nesselrode even expected an "inconclusive" reply

[3] F. O. 65/277, Nesselrode to Brunnow, Dec. 24, 1840; Jan. 5, 1841.

to the proposals outlined in his dispatch to Brunnow. But apparently Nicholas, well persuaded of the wisdom of the course he was pursuing, desired to act a more leading part than he had been playing in Eastern affairs and sought "something" of which he might "boast".[4]

Early in January, 1841, Palmerston received Clanricarde's reports upon the advances of the czar and Nesselrode and immediately he replied instructing the queen's ambassador to assure the Russians of the sincere wish of Her Majesty's government that the alliance between Great Britain and Russia "so happily cemented by recent events", might long continue and might not only tend to further the welfare and prosperity of the two countries but might also contribute "powerfully" to maintain the peace of the world. Clanricarde was to say also that the British government appreciated very highly the sound judgment with which the czar had acted throughout the crisis of 1840. There could not be a doubt but that the powerful naval and military forces which Nicholas had kept in reserve to be ready to act in case of need against the Egyptians had essentially contributed to the successful result which had been obtained, and at the same time the fact that those forces had not been prematurely brought into action had prevented some political difficulties which otherwise might have arisen.[5]

Having thus carefully acknowledged the importance of Russian coöperation in the settlement of Turco-Egyptian affairs Palmerston unhesitatingly refused to entertain the Russian proposal that the four powers should enter into an engagement to provide against a prospective French attack on the liberties of Europe. In a dispatch addressed to Clanricarde on January 11, 1841, the British minister of foreign affairs declared:

> State to the Tsar that we are much gratified by the confidence which he reposes in the English Government, and by the frank and open manner in which he has been pleased to communicate his views and opinions to you. We shall be equally open with the Tsar and will state exactly our sentiments on the subject on which he has touched in conversation with you.
>
> One of the general principles which we wish to observe as a guide for our conduct in dealing with the relations between England and other states is that changes which foreign nations may choose to make in their internal constitutions and forms of Government are to be looked upon as matters with which England has no business to interfere by force of arms for the purpose of imposing upon such nations a form of government which they do not wish to have, or for the purpose of preventing such nations from having institutions which they desire. These things are considered in England to be matters of domestick concern which every nation ought to be allowed to settle as it likes.

[4] F. O. 65/271, no. 4, Clanricarde to Palmerston, Jan. 13, 1841.

[5] F. O. 65/269, no. 5, Palmerston to Clanricarde, Jan. 11, 1841.

But an attempt of one nation to seize and to appropriate to itself territory which belongs to another nation, is a different matter; because such an attempt leads to a derangement of the existing balance of power, and by altering the relative strength of states, may tend to create danger to other Powers; and such attempts therefore, the British Government holds itself at full liberty to resist, upon the universally acknowledged principle of self-defence.

Now, it is quite true, as stated by the Emperor, that any country, such as France for instance, may, under the plea and pretext of altering its own institutions, seek to overthrow the existing Governments of other countries for the purpose of adding those countries to its own territories, or of associating them with its own aggresive system. And such proceedings would cease to be domestick changes of arrangement, and would assume the unquestionable character of external aggression. Such attempts England has in former times on many occasions resisted; and it is highly probable that if a similar case were again to arise, England would again pursue a similar course.

But it is not usual for England to enter into engagements with reference to cases which have not actually arisen, or which are not immediately in prospect: and this for a plain reason. All formal engagements of the Crown which involve the question of Peace or War must be submitted to Parliament; and Parliament might probably not approve of an engagement which should bind England prospectively to take up arms in a contingency which might happen at an uncertain time, and under circumstances which could not as yet be foreseen.

It is true that His Imperial Majesty has spoken of an understanding which need not be recorded in any formal instrument; but upon which he might rely if the turn of affairs should render it applicable to events. But this course would not be free from objections. For in the first place, it would scarcely be consistent with the spirit of the British Constitution for the Crown to enter into a binding engagement of such a nature without placing it formally upon record, so that Parliament might have an opportunity of expressing its opinion thereupon, and this could only be done by some written Instrument; and to such a course the objection which I have alluded to above would apply. But, if the engagement were merely verbal, though it would bind the Ministers who made it, it might be disavowed by their successors; and thus the Russian Government might be led to count upon a system of policy on the part of Great Britain which might not eventually be pursued.[6]

Under these circumstances, it seems to Her Majesty's Government that the Cabinet of St. Petersburgh should be satisfied to trust to the general tendency of the policy of Great Britain, which leads her to watch attentively and to guard with care the maintenance of the Balance of Power: and Her Majesty's Government hope that His Imperal Majesty will not think that this Policy is the less deeply rooted in the minds of Her Majesty's Government, if they should not think it expedient to enter at the present moment into engagements such as those mentioned by the Emperor.[7]

[6] These opinions are interesting in the light of the obligations which were practically implied in the Grey-Cambon letters of 1912. *Cf.* Fay, *Origins of the World War*, I. 322–323.

[7] F. O. 65/269, no. 6, Palmerston to Clanricarde, Jan. 11, 1841.

When Brunnow read to Palmerston Nesselrode's dispatch of early January, 1841, the British minister of foreign affairs claimed that Her Majesty's government "felt much gratified" by the fresh proof which that dispatch afforded of the sincerity of the czar's friendly feelings toward Great Britain and of the firm reliance which Great Britain might place on Russia if unfortunately the course of events in Europe should render the coöperation of those two powers necessary for the preservation of the balance of power. Yet to Brunnow, and in reply to Nesselrode's communication, Palmerston read a copy of the dispatch which he had addressed to Clanricarde on January 11.[8] Hence Nicholas and his ministers could not long have entertained any illusions about the feelings of the British government toward the Russian advances.

If the czar was greatly disappointed because of the failure of his moves to obtain British support for a permanent alliance of the four powers against France he succeeded in concealing that fact from Clanricarde. On February 23, 1841, the British ambassador reported to Palmerston that Nicholas had expressed himself "quite satisfied with the intentions and the feelings of Great Britain with regard to any attack that France might make upon the existing governments and political arrangements of continental Europe".

> I think, Clanricarde stated, the Emperor is at least as well pleased as his Minister at the confidential, and frank reply, which Your Lordship has made to his proposition. And he appears to contrast favourably the straight forward, and firm course pursued by Great Britain with the vacillation, and apparent timidity of the Austrian Cabinet.[9] . . . I do not hesitate to assure Your Lordship that at no time was there less ground than there is now for supposing that any intimate alliance can be established between France and Russia.[10]

[8] F. O. 65/269, no. 16, Palmerston to Clanricarde, Jan. 30, 1841.

[9] Again on March 9, 1841, Clanricarde reported that the czar had spoken "strongly" about Metternich and had said that neither England nor Russia could depend on Austria on account of the "timidity and vacillation of the Prince" who "had not the spirit of a Gentleman". According to the czar's opinion Metternich "had become aged, and had now a mania for writing papers upon all subjects", imagining that he could "advise upon every subject", and from his closet could 'direct and instruct all the world". *Cf.* F. O. 65/271, no. 24, Clanricarde to Palmerston, "Confidential", Mar. 9, 1841.

[10] F. O. 65/271, no. 15, Clanricarde to Palmerston, Feb. 23, 1841. Early in March, 1841, Clanricarde reported the czar as saying that "war was only deferred: the French would have it at last, if they dared . . . who could depend upon such people, with such a system of Government, or rather without any system at all"? The czar was reported to have said also that "even if, as he supposed, Louis Philippe was too clever to desire war, he [Nicholas] knew the Duke of Orleans had not so much sense, . . . and that if peace should be preserved during the King's lifetime, and the Duke of Orleans should succeed to the throne,—(not appearing to regard either event very probable),—war must then break out. But

Truly if Clanricarde was informed correctly in March, 1841, some of the Russian ministers were endeavoring to impress on the czar that he had been "too much led by England" and that the British would "play him false". "Doubtless when the temporary estrangement of the French and English governments shall have happily been removed", the British ambassador declared, "the Emperor cannot say that he has gained by the late transactions any selfish object of either personal or Russian policy. And unfortunately a gain, which is shared by his fellow-creatures, is seldom considered by a Russian as any gain at all."[11] Furthermore in June, 1841, after it was known generally that Lord Melbourne's cabinet was about to resign, the czar complained that if the British cabinet had adopted his proposal (presumably for an alliance against French aggression) the "line would have been clear; but now he was at a loss to conjecture what turn things might take, and what effect a change of government in England might have" upon British foreign relations.[12] Nevertheless on the same occasion Nicholas let it be understood that his distrust of France and his dislike for Louis Philippe had not abated, and after Peel and Aberdeen had entered office in Great Britain late in 1841 the czar reaffirmed in no uncertain terms his desire to maintain friendly relations with the British government.[13] Indeed the close coöperation between Great Britain and Russia during the Eastern crisis of 1839–1841 marked the opening of an era of cordial relations between the two countries which continued until after the outbreak of the revolutions of 1848.[14] Although the czar's plan for a permanent

the Emperor said that as long as a sincerely good understanding was maintained between England and Russia, the chances of war in Europe were thereby greatly diminished, and the result, if war should come, was not to be feared." *Cf.* Clanricarde to Palmerston, no. 24, as cited above in footnote no. 9. *Cf.* also F. O. 65/271, no, 5, Clanricarde to Palmerston, "Confidential", Jan. 18, 1841.

[11] Clanricarde to Palmerston, no. 24 as cited above in footnote no. 9.

[12] F. O. 65/272, no. 21, Bloomfield to Palmerston, June 30, 1841.

[13] F. O. 65/273, no. 11, Stuart de Rothesay to Aberdeen, Nov. 22, 1841. In this dispatch the British ambassador described how the czar had again aired his views on France. According to the opinion of Nicholas the conduct of Louis Philippe in Spain was not only unworthy of a great sovereign but also of a "'gentleman'". The czar "launched into expressions", Lord Stuart explained, "which indicate a personal feeling stronger than I consider to be warranted by any circumstance which has come to my knowledge".

Nesslerode as well as the czar gave cordial assurances to the new British government late in 1841. *Cf.* F. O. 65/272, no. 73, Bloomfield to Aberdeen, Oct. 12, 1841; F. O. 65/273, Nesselrode to Brunnow, Sept. 20; Oct. 2, 1841.

[14] Both the czar and Nesselrode were "much pleased" with the reception which they received when they visited England in 1844. On June 29, 1844, Bloomfield wrote from St. Petersburg: ". . . in fact it is my duty to state that the effect produced here by the Emperor's late journey has been everything we could have desired, and will doubtless tend to sustain and promote the cordial understanding

alliance of the four powers against France was unhesitatingly rejected at the court of St. James, Nicholas could perhaps claim that his advances had helped to allay British suspicion of his intentions and had aided in bringing to a close a long period of serious Anglo-Russian rivalry in the Levant.

The University of Illinois. FREDERICK STANLEY RODKEY.

which exists between the two governments." *Cf.* F. O. 65/300, no. 63, Bloomfield to Aberdeen, June 29, 1844; F. O. 65/301, no. 140, Bloomfield to Aberdeen, Oct. 26, 1844.

DOCUMENT

William Shirley to Samuel Waldo

THE following letter concerns an episode in colonial politics: the successful intrigue in the 1730's to oust Governor Belcher of Massachusetts and to put William Shirley in his place. The special significance of this document is that it shows the complicity of Shirley in the scheme. The fact of his complicity has been common knowledge because at a meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society, on July 9, 1857 (*Proceedings,* III. 216), extracts from several of Shirley's letters, proving his share in the plot, were read aloud. But these letters were not included in the volumes of Shirley's *Correspondence,* edited by Charles H. Lincoln, nor could George A. Wood, author of *William Shirley, Governor of Massachusetts, 1741–1756,* find any trace of them (I. 73). They came to light in the Knox Manuscripts (L. 43 ff.), the collection owned by the New England Historical and Genealogical Society but on deposit in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. The Samuel Waldo to whom they were addressed was a rich Boston merchant, mast-agent, and landed proprietor, for whom Shirley acted as permanent attorney. Waldo was one of Belcher's bitterest enemies because he believed that the governor had deliberately tried to ruin his attempts to settle his wild lands in Maine by questioning his title to the property and stirring up the Indians to resist the settlers. In 1738 Waldo went to London and there worked indefatigably with others to bring about the overthrow of Belcher, while Shirley remained in Boston, secretly collaborating with the governor's foes: suggesting, directing, and forwarding money to Waldo. It was rumored that Waldo had vowed to ruin himself, if necessary, in order to ruin Belcher.

Milwaukee-Downer College. AMELIA C. FORD.

BOSTON Aprill 15. 1739.

Dear Sir/

Y'r two last fav'rs by Flucker, and Snelling are both safely come to hand, and am much oblig'd to you for all the Instances and Expressions of y'r friendship and Goodness to me: As to y'r Sentim'ts concerning my Proposal of y'r bearing part of the Expence, w'ch will attend the Obtaining a Commiss'n for me, I shall intirely submit to 'em, having some doubt in my own Mind whether my proposal to you was altogether right, w'ch I have in my Letter by Hall to Mrs. Shirley[1] mention'd:

[1] Shirley's wife, Frances, was also in England at this time, trying to secure her husband's promotion to a better post. She had the advantage of relationship with the family of the Duke of Newcastle.

The Advantage w'ch you will reap from my being Gov'r I don't think is in itself a Reason, why you should contribute towards the Expences of procuring it for me; I do assure you, I think you entitul'd to all the possible good Consequences of it, even thô you should not have the Share, w'ch you will have, in procuring it for me, having ever exerted from the first knowledge of me an open, disinterested, and sincere Friendship for me; And the pleasure w'ch I shall ever take in making you returns of Friendship will be a suffic't recompence to me for any Service I can do for you, and outweigh the Consideration of Interest: But what brought me into that way of thinking, was the largeness of my family, and the inequality of my Circumstances to it, join'd w'th the Consideration of your own saving a large Sum of Money by means of my Interest (not Services w'ch I could afterwards do you, and grant you are entitul'd to on all Acc'ts) and my taking this preferm't w'th the Incumbrance of £1500 Sterl'g Expence or more in lieu of some other, w'ch I had a good prospect of, without such Expence and quitting my profession for it; taking in likewise the Consideration of y'r happy Circumstances, so much superior to mine: But I am content that Mrs. Shirley should give you a Bond in my Name for all sums w'ch you shall advance on my Acc't w'th her Consent, and am not in the least afraid that there can be a different way of thinking between us, when we are both entirely at liberty to act as reason, and Honour shall direct, without any other Obligations upon us: And I think her power to give such security in my name is unquestionably large enough.[1a] . . . I am not at all affraid of the Danger of being turn'd out of the Governm't; If it should fall to my lott, to have it; being sufficiently persuaded that I shall be pretty strong by means of a family Interest; my personal Acquaintance w'th the Newcastle family; and several other Friends in Parliam't who have a Value for me, and would, in all probability, some of 'em be able to serve me, if the present Ministry should be out. . . . Besides I don't doubt (as I think no Honest Man need) of establishing a good Interest in the Country upon the lasting principles of Justice and Honour in the Administration of the Governm't; and if in three or four Years time, I could get leave to spend a few Months at home, I doubt not, by the Advantageous Circumstances of my Post, family, and large Acquaintance among persons of Interest in all Degrees, but that I should increase my friends and my Interest very much. . . . And these are the Considerations, w'ch induce me to accept of this Post, if we can get it, preferably to another, w'ch possibly, considering all things, it might be more safe, and gainfull for me to have. . . . As to y'r Calculate of the profits, I have no great Notion of the $\frac{1}{3}$ of Sheriff's Fees, nor above £500 Sterl ann. in Lands: Free Gifts, except upon the first coming to the Governm't I can't in the least depend upon: The one Year's Salary Advance indeed is considerable, and what I did not know. . . . I am in hopes that as Pemberton's Appointm't of Naval Officer must end w'th the Gov'r who appointed him, that his Grace of Newcastle will not oblige me to lopp off that perquisite, especially when the two Governm'ts[2] are divided; and there is much Difference between turning Pemberton out, and not obliging me to give him a fresh appointment: But you over rate the neat profits both of that post, and Clerk of the Inferior Court for the County

[1a] The dots (. . .) indicate dashes (—) in the original, not omissions.

[2] The governments of Massachusetts and New Hampshire were united at this time.

of Suffolk. . . . As to other posts, except Sheriff of Suffolk, they are, as you observe, not considerable. . . . I shall, I must confess, be well pleas'd, not to lye under any Obligation to Eliakim Palmer; nor do I apprehend that he is capable of doing either hurt or good, tho I don't know what his Uncle's Interest is. . . . And as to y'r assurance of Mr. Phipps continuing to be Lieuten't Gov'r; if he quits upon Terms, as I propose, y'r Word will be kept, and you may have that Post, if you please. . . . I take particular Notice of y'r Generous regards for Mr. Boydell; w'ch gives me much pleasure.

In the meantime, the Gov. and his friends exult very much, and set at Defiance all Attempts ag't him; and he seems much pleas'd w'th his Letters. . . . The Secretary (who is a good Honest Man, tho of small capacity) tells me that if he has any Judgm't, the Answer of the Committee to the New Hampshire Compl't [3] is full, and that the Compl't must come to nothing; and the Advantage gain'd over the Gov'r at the last hearing was intirely owing to the Gov'rs Counsiell's not being rightly instructed. . . . I must own that I am intirely of your Opinion that it would have been safest to deferr'd Leighton's Compl't [4] till the Return of the Papers from New Hampshire; and am very doubtfull of the force and Effect of that by itself, unassisted w'th others; Thô I am in hopes you will receive Woodside's [5] Compl't in time to second it: and I cannot conceive why Mr. Paris and Tomlinson have so slight an Opinion of your Compl't. As to Col Dunbarr's [6] I cannot tell what it is; but I have no great Opinion of any coming from him; Inclosed is a Letter from Mr. Bollan;[7] I wish heartily it had been sent over in the form of an affidavit at first; but it can't properly be done without taking out new Copies, and introducing the material Circumstances ag't the Gov'r by that means without an apparent view of doing it merely for the sake of Accusing him of Slighting the King's Order. This shall be done in time, I hope, to come by the next Ship w'ch will be ab't a fortnight hence, but can't before this goes. . . . If the Compl't fails you now for want of it; It seems to me that you might, when the New Hampshire Papers come over bring it upon the Carpet again in the Shape of a Compl't from the agent Contractor w'th the Governm't for supplying the Navy, upon the fresh Evidences and Circumstances particularly respecting the Gov'r; I suppose this petition of Compl't is in Leighton's name, w'ch is not in the nature of it more pointed at the Governour than the Judges. . . . And I shall also send you over papers to show that Frost was supported in

[3] An attack from Belcher's New Hampshire foes.

[4] William Leighton of Kittery, Maine, whom Waldo hired to get out a supply of masts, and whom Shirley, as Waldo's counsel, defended in the suit for trespass brought against Leighton by John Frost.

[5] A captain in command of the fort at Pemaquid in the eastern country. Belcher was accused of neglecting the defenses there.

[6] David Dunbar, the particular friend and agent of Colonel Martin Bladen of the British board of trade. He was active in New England affairs during the 1730's, not only as surveyor general of the King's Woods, as lieutenant governor of New Hampshire, but also as developer of the eastern lands between the Kennebec and St. Croix rivers, under a commission as governor of "Sagadahoc". He established himself at Pemaquid and introduced settlers. Rival claimants to this region succeeded in canceling the Crown's claim to this territory and forcing Dunbar out. Governor Belcher and Dunbar quarreled almost continually.

[7] Shirley's son-in-law.

that Appeal by the Governm't wherein the Gov'r must be concurring, and now he calls those persons of his Council who have been parties ag't the Crown in this Affair to advise him not to put the King's Order in Execution; and he has not thought fit to take so much Notice of the Order as to talk w'th the Judges ab't it, and see if it could be put in Execution any way, but has immediately rejected it, thinking himself safe in doing anything with the Advice of his Council, thô never so much ag't his Duty and the Service of the Crown. . . . I cannot be of Opinion that under my Circumstances it is proper that my Letters should have been Affidavits; It must offend any Generous Temper to see a Man turn Evidence ag't another person whose post he is seeking; in order to deprive him of that Post, w'ch he is in quest of; But I am well satisfied the Matter of Leighton's Compl't, if that Compl't now miscarries, may be w'th the help of New Evidence work'd up into a new Compl't from other parties, and come as an Auxiliary to the New Hampshire Compl't, and I will prepare papers accordingly. . . . I must own that I think the separating these Complt's will weaken everyone of 'em, tho' there is much in what Mr. Paris says of keeping up the Resentm't of the Lords, and not letting it flag, or cool. . . . The showing of this Letter to Mrs. Shirley will be the same thing as my writing to her concerning her giving any Bond for what sums you shall be pleased to advance for me; and to let her know, that tho' in my last I told her I should prefer Jekyll's Post, if it could be got; yet since we are engaged so deeply in this Scheme of getting the Governm't, and it will lie in my Power to serve my family and friends by it, and (what is not intirely to be thrown out of the Scale of Consideration) what will be an Honour to me; and that I shall contribute to the turning out of a very great Rascal; tho' she thinks so tenderly, and I may say, weakly ab't him, especially after his Usage of me lately, I desire by all means that we may accomplish our present Scheme, if it is to be done upon any reasonable Terms; . . . I here inclose the Papers you write for together w'th Robinson's Affidavit; tho' something diffrent from y'r Copy, but such an one as he could make and, I hope, to get Litheo's tomorrow, under the Province Seal; I thought the securest Way to get the Copies of the Records and Province Seal was to demand 'em myself of the Secretary, w'ch I did, and was determin'd to have 'em, or quarrell for it: . . . I should think it would be of Service, if you was to take an Opportunity of convincing Mr. Holden [8] what a Stalking Horse the Gov'r makes of Religion; how ridiculously he stop'd at the Quaker's Meeting House in his way to Piscataqua, and after they had done preaching telling 'em in the Meeting house that he liked their way very well, and had a great Esteem for Quakers, and that he has publickly declar'd that the End of his making Laws in Ease of Quakers and Anabaptists was to gain their Interest in England, w'ch he has told me w'th great Triumph as a masterpiece of his Policy. . . . And pray tell him particularly that his only Quarrel ag't the Church is that when he courted 'em, they despised him, knowing his foppery and Hypocrisy. . . . But above all let him know that Mr. Marsh of the Middle Temple told this Story publickly of him ab't 8 or 9 Years ago at the East Grinsted Assizes one Day after Dinner among the Counsellors that while Belcher was Agent in England, he was well acquainted w'th him, and observed that he affected a most precise, puritanical behaviour be-

[8] A nonconformist London banker, and generous friend to the Puritan church in New England.

for him, thinking, that as Marsh was bred up at a Presbyterian Academy (thô I am not certain of that) it would please him; But that happening to meet him in the Park a day or two after he had kissed the King's hand for the Governm't of New England, he assumed quite another Romantic, Rakish Air, swore much and gave himself foolish Airs, knowing that Marsh was no great Religionist, thô bred up a Presbyterian; that Marsh was astonished at the Change, but upon going to the Coffee house found in one of the Papers, that he had lately kissed the King's Hand for the Governm't; Whereupon said Marsh (in these very words) from that time I set the Man down for a Rascal; and it was publicly said among all the Counsell of the Circuit; I set next but one to him when he told us the Story; It was just after he had toasted the King and the good People of England; . . . If you could conveniently ask Mr. Marsh ab't it; he must recollect it, and his veracity no Man doubts . . . I think he is not a Serg't tho of long Standing; and Mr. Hatsell, no doubt, knows him; He is of Rochester, and was Recorder there, and was always called by the name of Jack Marsh, by his Country Men. . . . I observe particularly what you mention of Little Partridge's expressing his Contempt, and hope some time or other to let him know that he is a little Insignificant fellow . . . Whatever you promise in my name to Woodside in his way, you may depend upon my performance of it: and whatever you think proper to do in regard to Capt'n Tomlinson, I shall be oblig'd to you for; And shall think myself obliged to you for whatever Sums, you shall disburse for me in concert with Mrs. Shirley, who I doubt not will take y'r Advice and Judgm't therein—I will look after what you write concerning the Patent and grant of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and send 'em by the next Ship . . . But I received yours by Snelling very late last night, and today is Sunday, and this Vessell is expected to go tomorrow by the way of Hamburgh . . . I have sent your Letter to Mrs. Waldo, and will particularly observe what you write concerning her, and wait on her to Morrow Morning . . . And have taken care ab't letting Mr. Atkinson and the Piscataqua Gentlemen know that I am at their service, and will wait upon 'em by the return of the Post, if they desire it; have sent 'em in the mean time Advice concerning their demanding the Seal, w'ch if they don't do forthwith, I can foresee they will lose the vacation, and have done this by means of Mr. Dering who presses 'em very much to dispatch by Harry Caswall's Ship . . . Major Phillips goes home by that Ship, who was one of the Commissioners upon settling the Line; very strong in favour of New Hampshire, and bitter ag't Belcher: They have I understand, been feeling his Pulse for the Gov'r; But he frankly declares he thinks the N. H. people had injustice done 'em by the Gov'r and will testifye it, if called upon, at St. James's; I shall take all the Care, I can of him, here; and must recommend it to you and Capt'n Tomlinson to take what care you can of him on the other side of the Water; In the meantime Atkinson is wrote to apprizing him of this, w'th Advice to pay all Means what is due to him before he leaves N. England . . . I am much surprized at Mr. Cornelius Waldo's[9] behaviour; he declared to me over and over that you had to his certain knowledge a clear Estate of more Value than £80,000, and wondered Mr. Faneuil should be so scrupulous as to insist upon that particular Security, and yet he does it in Effect at the same

[9] A cousin with whom Samuel was in a business partnership for a time. Boston *News Letter*, Sept. 5, 1734.

time; I shall talk w'th him ab't it as freely as is proper; and likewise to make Mrs. Waldo easy—But if you do execute the Mortgage; send Mr. Cornelius Waldo another, as you propose by all means . . . You should take particular care that L'd Chief Justice Wilks is at the hearing of Leightons Compl't and to spirit up the L'd Chancell'r, who has wrote a Civil Letter to the Gov'r by means of Jonathan, w'ch I have seen; so care sh'd be taken of him by means of Mr. Hatsell and Mr. Western whose Father was a great Croney of the Chancell'rs. . . . I have been oblig'd to draw a Bill of Exchange of £150 Sterl. upon Mrs. Shirley payable to Mr. Hall; and if Mrs. Shirley should be at a Nonplus for the paym't of it, shall be obliged to you, if you could assist her in it; and I could depend upon paying you in a few Months at all Events . . . I doubt not, when the Grand Enemy is remov'd, but the Indians will be complying enough, and shall not scruple to act in favor of the Settlem'ts [10] without an Instruction, w'ch I don't desire for the sake of my acting more vigorously; But the very Sound of such a thing will be as good as a Detachm't of Soldiers from Annapolis, and be a considerable Advantage to us: and a proper Reprimand to the Country for what they did upon the Compl't of the Indians,[11] and so be of Consequence . . . As to the New Hampshire Governm't I shall be as easy without it, as w'th it . . . And as to getting Mr. Wilks to join w'th us, I leave it intirely to y'r Discretion, and will make good any Promises, you shall think advisable to make . . . But if you can do it safely get quite clear of Eliakim Palmer, and make him no more promises than you have done; I have not, nor ever had the least Notion of a Possibility of his succeeding; and I would avoid any pretence of Obligation from him, as much as may be . . . However if you can't do without his Money, we must be Civil.

April 21. 1739.

I have just now heard that it is the Opinion of the most considerable Merch'ts in the City that the Ministry (w'ch I hope is not true) will not continue beyond this summer; w'ch, if so, will much affect, if not intirely ruin all our Schemes; thô Mr. Nedham will be right for us then: . . . I have offer'd my Services to the Gentlemen of New Hampshire, as you desired me; and they have accepted it; and I set out early on Monday morning to go to Portsmouth: Shepardson is not yet arrived, tho I hope at Anchor within sight; but we are not yet certain, whether it is he or no; Atkinson writes me word, he brings the last Order of Council for the Province Seal etc. . . . I am a little affraid we shall not save Harry Caswall's Ship . . . Partridge certainly writes to the Gov'r that he has strong Assurances of his not being removed; I wonder from what Quarter it comes . . . You must by this time have heard from Capt Tomlinson what Effect the Gov'r's answer to the Compl't may in all probability have . . . Dering has already procured Peter Faneuil's Consent to your having Allen's £1000, if Davenport approves of it, w'ch I shall endeavor to secure today; and don't much doubt of it . . . Peter

[10] Waldo's settlements of Scotch-Irish on his lands (the Muscongus patent) on the Maine coast, bordering the St. George's River.

[11] A committee of the Massachusetts legislature reported adversely to Waldo and in favor of the Indians, until they could find out who were the rightful owners of the land on the Georges above the falls. Waldo's pamphlet, *A Defence of the Title of the late John Leverett, Esq; to a Tract of Land in the Eastern Parts of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay, commonly called Muscongus Lands,* etc. 1736.

is very angry w'th Allen's Scheme: heartily wishes you Success, tho I don't know whether he knows the Scheme, but believe he does . . . It is well, I did not arrest Kilby, as y'r People would have had me; It would have touch'd Peter to the heart w'th resentm't, if I had. . . . As it is uncertain to me what turn Leighton's Petition has taken; and whether it will have any Effect to our Purpose Inclosed I send you Materials to work up that Matter into a new Compl't in another Shape; w'ch might, it seems to me, be brought on in aid of their New Hampshire Compl't either in the name of Mr. Gulston as Contractor w'th the Governm't, if he will lend his name and appear in it, or else in Col. Dunbarr's name, as he is his Maj'y's Surveyor Gen'l of the Woods for the Use of the Royal Navy, and so has a Relation to the Case, as being a Person intrusted for the Interest of the Crown in the woods in general: And the Substance of the Compl't [12] may be to this Effect Viz. That Mr. Gulston has contracted w'th the Governm't etc. that his Agents in New England had a License from the Surveyor-gen'l to cut down etc. that they cut those Trees of Frosts etc. that Frost sued 'em in an Action of Trespass upon the Province Laws in the 10th W3 and 13 G 1 etc, that Leighton pleaded the Reservation in the Royal Charter etc. in barr of the Action; that the Court refus'd to receive the Plea; and made up Judgm't by Default ag't him for the Treble Value, (as I think) that Leighton prayed an Appeal to his Maj'y in Council, w'ch the Court deny'd, that he obtain'd an Order from his Maj'y for the Allowance of an Appeal; that upon the Arrival of that Order Frost petition'd the Gov'r, Council, and Assembly etc. his Defence ag't that Order, might be carried on at the publick Charge, as ag't: a Grievance to the Country; that the Gov. countenanced, and concurr'd w'th the gen'l Court in granting that Petition, in Opposition to his Maj'y's Order in Council; and Frost was maintained in his Defence at home in part, at the publick Expence, Viz. by Mr. Wilks paying 30 Guineas; that afterwards when the King's Order for reversing the Appeal, and restitution of the Money arrived, the Gov'r concurr'd w'th the Judges in rejecting it as an Illegal thing; and complained of it as such to Mr. Bollan, who serv'd the Order upon him; and that his Excuse that it was not served upon him first is a mere Pretence; for that he actually was informed the Order was come, before it was presented to the Judges; and did not offer his Assistance towards getting it put in Execution; all w'ch tends to the prejudice of the Crown's Interest in the Woods, by the Gov'r's publickly countenancing such suits as Frost brought to the Oppression of the Workmen in the Service of the Crown, and Illegal Judgm't ag't them; as well as to the Destruction of his Maj'y's Royal Authority and Jurisdiction in matters of Appeal concerning the Royal Woods.

May 9. 1739

Last Monday was fortnight I went to Piscataqua to assist in drawing and authenticating the Papers upon the New Hampshire Compl't; and upon a commission from the L'ds of Admiralty, w'ch the Copy of my Letter to Mr. Burchett will disclose to you . . . It will be endless to tell you w't fatigue, vexation and disappointm't I have had for these 17 days last continually between the New Hampshire Gentlemen, the Gov'r and his Secretary Waldron: However I think we have compass'd everything

[12] See Andrew McFarland Davis, The Case of Frost *vs.* Leighton, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, II. 229–240, for an exhaustive account of the famous lawsuit which Shirley here summarizes.

at last, and shall send all, Mr. Paris and Tomlinson's wants by the Mast Ship, which goes the last Week of this Month; if we can't save Harry Caswall's Vessel, w'ch is expected to sail to Morrow Morning; and in whom Major Phillips comes over, who was the fast friend of the New Hampshire Gentlemen upon the Settlem't of the Lines, and one of the Commissioners and is a bitter Enemy, and says he will be a swift Witness ag't the Gov'r; therefore you must take all Imaginable care of him, when he comes on your side of the water . . . We have sent no less than three Expresses backwards and forwards from hence to Piscataqua this Week; got H. Caswall to detain his Vessel for us on purpose one day: And there is a Possibility for the last Express to return w'th all Papers by to morrow Morning, but I don't expect it, But you may depend upon 'em by the Mast Ship: It being mentioned in the last Order that all the Minutes, Proceedings etc. are to be attested by the Secretary, w'ch as to the proceedings of the House of Representatives was unnecessary and ag't Rule, has given me Infinite Difficulty and almost ruined everything: But I have not time to enter into the particulars . . . Your bills for the second thousand pounds Sterl'g are come to Mr. Baker by this Ship; and I am assured by Ben Faneuil, that you may have £500 more, and by Davenport that Peter will advance one or two thousand more, if it is wanted for the purpose, w'ch he knows, it seems, and that the Scheme is for me to succeed the Gov'r; for w'ch I am much oblig'd to him: His Exc'y and I have had a Quarrell in the Province House upon his threatening me ab't my being too busy in executing the Commissions of the L'ds of Admiralty. He also talk'd to me so insolently ab't y'r Affairs concerning w'ch he tells me he has wrote home volumes, and talk'd in such a manner that if you had heard him, it would have gall'd you to the heart, as it did me; however I believe what I said to him did not leave him very easy; he threatens you much: And in short he must be got out, or I don't see how you can return w'th any Comfort for the rest of your Days, or I live here w'th any satisfaction; not that I am affraid of any hurt he can do me, if he keeps in; but it would rob me of great Satisfaction to see the Rascal triumphant, and enjoy the fruits of his Wickedness; And I will contentedly take the Governm't w'th any Incumbrance, which will not hurt rather than better my family by the Change: But if you find it necessary to advance a sum so much larger than we expect, as that I cannot bear it, you must assist and bear part of it; and I doubt not but we shall both agree in our notions of what is reasonable . . . But we must determine to get him out almost at any rate . . . And Mrs. Shirley and you, will I doubt not settle it, as she has power from me . . . I was w'th Mrs. Waldo today; She is so spirited in the affair that she says she will readily give up her Thirds of all rather than he should continue in . . . But it seems to me that his Fate is inevitable, if our Papers come over safe; However I am very sorry that Leighton's Compl't came on to be heard before the New Hampshire . . . I hope the Admiralty Affair will in some Measure make amends; if you can possibly get 'em to look into it without giving him a formal Notice to answer for himself, w'ch he labours at w'th all his might; You will see w't pains I have taken to fortifie all the Facts alledged in it w'th undeniable proof as to the principal Ones, and if S'r Charles Wager can be prevail'd on to attend, it must raise his Resentm't, and make him an Enemy: I suspect him at present to be favourable in his Opinion of the Gov'r: who I know upon this Occasion will write to him and endeavor to prejudice him ag't any

Report that Auchmuty and I shall make by suggesting that the Judge is his bitter Enemy, and I am seeking his Post: You must take care of this and get at Sir Charles properly: Mr. Medcalfe a Friend of mine knows Mr. Winnington one of the L'ds of the Admiralty and I believe could introduce you to him. If you could by means of Dean Auchmuty Spur up my L'd Granard ag't him to speake to Sir Charles Wager ab't this Affair it might be of Service: You know what an Errant Villain he has been to the King's Interest in the Woods w'ch nearly affects the Navy. The making the most of the L'ds of the Admiralty in this Affair will be of great Importance in your other Affairs ag't him. You have my Letter to you concern'g the Gov'rs Application to me to draw the Exeter Compl't, and observe what I say of it in my Letter to Mr. Burchett; therefore must insist that you don't produce it without Mrs. Shirley's taking the Advice of her Friends upon it and utmost Necessity and an express Declaration of the L'ds of the Admiralty that they expected it from me and that I ought to have done it and you know it was wrote before I had thought of the Governm't . . . I hope Col Dunbar and you will not be so imprud't as to Contract a Coolness at this Juncture so as to weaken both y'r Interests . . . What gives me the greatest Uneasiness in the Matter is that the D. of Newcastle seems by his Answer to Mrs. Shirley unwilling to turn J B out; and that he has some access to his Grace by an Underhand Friend; and tho' I doubt not of his Promise in case Belcher is out; yet I am affraid he is not very willing he should go out. Pray make a narrow Scratching into that Matter, and find out where it sticks if you can . . . Can't the Colonel likewise make something of these papers w'ch are to come before the Admiralty upon the hearing of his Compl't ag't him. I send you Mr. Bollan's Letter but believe now there will be no Necessity for his Affidavit. Surely the Compl't w'ch Woodside has brot w'th him may be of Service; Demolishing of a Fort and Dismantling of a Garrison don't sound well to a Ministry; and the Situation of the Subscribers will move Compassion and the exhibiting it w'th proper Affidavits annex'd to it, so as to be read only if you proceed no further upon it may be of Service . . . He has he tells me let the Ministry know that the Eastern Lands are not worth 2d per Acre; You remember w't he says of em in one of his Speeches to the Contrary[13] . . . I can add no more now than that you may depend upon all Papers according to y'r Wishes, w'th affidavits of all Facts that are any ways material . . . Be cautious how you let Col Dunbarr know that I have sent you a Copy of my Report to the L'ds of Admiralty least he sh'd be disgusted at it; and ask him to let you see his; If the Express does not return from Piscataqua tonight I shall not be able to send my Admiralty Papers nor the original Report because I can't compleat it; But will by the Mast Ship . . . I wish Mrs. Shirley would narrowly watch whether J. B. says anything to the Duke concerning his having done me any Services; and to take a proper Occasion to assure him that I look upon the Ballance to be on my Side, and that over and above that, he has us'd me exceeding ill of late: and if he could be apprized anyways of his Treachery to Col. Dunbar it would arm him ag't giving any Credit to his Insinuations . . . Pray are you sure that Mr. Stone is not J. B.'s friend . . . Ben Faneuil says Sharpe is of great Service

[13] In several places Governor Belcher praises these lands. See *Collections* of the Mass. Hist. Soc., 6th series, VI. 193–195; 481, 482; 15 Mass. *Court Records*, pp. 254, 296–297.

to him: That will not serve himself, if he goes too far and fails at last: I have said all that I can think of till the Papers come or have time to say except that I am w'th greatest sincerity

Dear Sir—

You will be informed how exasperated the Town of Boston is ag't J. B. at present. Sir Ferdinando Gorge's patent I will look into and send w't occurs by next Ship of Col Wendell wh'ch puts her Letters in at the Downs and Sails for Hamburgh. The other person after he had agreed to make affidavit as Capt Robinson has done was affraid of the Gov. It is well you wrote to me to go to Piscataqua. You would not else have had the papers these two Months yet as the Gentlemen themselves there agree; notwithstanding that they had the most pressing and even reproachful Letters sent 'em every post almost, for Six Weeks before from Boston . . . As to your compl't upon further thoughts if Woodside is made use of, I think there will be no Occasion for it . . . Mr. Cornelius Waldo seems very well satisfied at your Mortgaging the Houses etc. to Mr. Faneuil; He came to me ab't 8 days ago w'n I was exceeding busy w'th Mr. Packer at my House and promised to call the next Day before he went to Worcester but could not and is not yet returned, But there can be no Doubt of his being satisfied; Especially if you send him a Mortgage of some of your Lands in Middlesex; if he was as other men he would want no such thing . . . Inclos'd in Mr. Faneuil's to Mr. Baker is the Additional Mortgage you proposed to give; It is more than suffic't. But we must not disgust Peter, now he is in so good a humour, as to any of his whims. Inclosed are two Letters for Capt'n Tomlinson to whom and Mr. Paris be pleas'd to give my Service . . . If I could be secure that it would be thought right that the Letter of mine to you concerning the gov's desiring me to draw the Exeter Compl't for him ought to be produc'd to the L'ds of the Admiralty I should be very willing to have it go; For as he w'd not take my Advice as he promis'd but pursued his Rascally Scheme, after he own'd it was wrong to do it, I think I was at liberty to divulge it out of Justice to the Person he injured. . . . I sh'd think if Col Dunbar was to insist upon it as a Piece of Justice to him, and w't I ought to do in Obedience to that Letter sent to me by Order of the L'ds of the Admiralty, and to tell Mrs. Shirley that if I secreted that part of my Knowledge of the matters I was to inquire into; and sh'd not consent to your producing that Letter before the Board of Admiralty especially since the same was wrote to you before there was any View of mine for the Governm't. He w'd complain ag't me to the Lords of the Admiralty who might possibly censure me for it so as to prejudice me; This w'd put her upon Shewing this Letter to her Friends and telling them her difficulty and asking their Advice; and if by any means young Mr. Pelham could be prevailed on to manage so as that the D. of Newcastle might see this Letter and be told the whole Matter w'th my real Objection ag't producing it, that it might be construed a wrong thing in me under my Circumstances that such a Letter of mine sh'd be produc'd notwithstanding it was wrote before I could have any Views of the Governm't it w'ld have a two fold good Effect Viz in the first place Shew w't a Rascal J B is and in the next place make me secure either in producing or not producing it according as he sh'd apprehend the Matter. If this could be rightly brot ab't it w'd be of great Service in thoroughly convincing the Duke what a Rascal Belcher is; and surely it might be done either thrô Mr. Pelham or Mr.

Stone or Mr. Stanyan and w'd it be amiss to engage Mr. Stone (if it is proper to attempt it) by a Present to take an Opportunity of shewing the Duke this Letter with a Copy of Mr. Auchmuty's Affidavit and Pollard's, and Slade's ushering them in by telling his Grace Mrs. Shirley's Difficulties least on one hand I sh'd incurr the Censure of the Lds of the Admiralty thrô Col. Dunbar's Compl't and on the other hand be tho't to do an ungenerous thing ag't the Gov. by suffering it to be produc'd; you will observe the Circumstances of Mr. Auchmutys calling upon me, likewise in his Letter to do it in Support of his Affidavit, and w't I say in my Letter to Mr. Burchett in Answ to it; all this if it is practicable w'd have a very good Effect. For it is a confounded rascally thing after a man has acknowledg'd such a piece of management to be unjustifiable, as he did, and promis'd not to do it, and was so conscious of it as to desire Secrecy, yet to do it ag't Advice and the convict'n of his own Mind is Roguish to the last degree; Add to that all this was done in support of the profess'd Enemies and Destroyers of the King's Woods . . . pray bring it ab't to the Duke's Knowledge, if possible. Could not Col. Dunbar also go to Sir Charles Wager and desire you might be sent to by 'em, having a Commiss'n from me; in case you found I sh'd incurr censure by not mentioning it in my Report to produce that Letter to 'em. But let the Duke have the Knowledge of it at all Events in some proper way or other; and indeed there may be danger in my being censur'd by the L'ds of the Admiralty if I don't take care ab't it . . . Mr. Faneuil's Order is gone and the Money is ready for you. Don't forget that it is particularly mention'd to his Grace what I say as to this matter in my Letter to Mr. Burchett and what cautions I gave you ab't it, and that the Letter to you was wrote before I knew or thought of any Application of my Friends for the Govm't in my favor. . . . The same directions are expected to be observed as to this second Bond and Mortgage as on the former concerning Duplicates. Davenport tells me and desires I would let you know that tho' six months is set for the paym't of the money, it may lie as long as he and you live, if you please.

[Last sentence not in the original but in the duplicate.]

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Who Were the Greeks? By JOHN LINTON MYRES, Wykeham Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. [Sather Classical Lectures, volume VI.] (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1930. Pp. xxxvii, 634. $7.00.)

HARDLY more than two generations ago it was still customary to regard the Greeks as a more or less pure race of invaders who had swept in from their Aryan home in Asia, bringing with them Indo-European speech, Hellenic religion and culture. The archæological discoveries of the past fifty years have thrust back the borders of history in the Ægean some three millenniums. The abundant fresh evidence now accessible has led students in recent years to turn their attention toward a more intensive examination of the problem of the racial origin of the Greeks.

In the impressive volume now before us we find marshaled all the available testimony in a systematic, discriminating, and searching inquiry which explores the fields of geography, anthropology, comparative philology, comparative religion, and archæology. From all these sources Professor Myres concludes that the Greeks were (as they themselves believed) a composite race, and that this race was in the main the result of a fusion of three diverse elements, themselves probably composite. The first of these was the race that occupied Greece in the late Stone Age, a brachycephalic, dark haired Alpine-Armenoid breed, which had already before 3000 B.C. evolved a settled agricultural state of civilization. The second element which spread over the Aegean and the mainland at the beginning of the Bronze Age was of the long-headed, dark Mediterranean race; and to it was due the highly developed, artistic, urban culture of Minoan Crete. The third element was an Aryan, Indo-European-speaking race, which made its first appearance shortly after 2000 B.C. and continued for many centuries to trickle into Greek lands. All three races were already mongrels, and a northern strain is apparent as early as the Early Bronze Age.

In chapter VI. these conclusions are tested in the light of Greek folk memory and traditions, and there is a very original and valuable discussion of the genealogies and their significance for the reconstruction of early Greek history. This is followed in chapter VII. by a comprehensive survey of the period of transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age, with which is included an ingenious attempt to trace the larger movements involved in a redistribution of the main tribes of the Greek peoples and to follow the track of the Dorian invasion. And finally in the concluding chapter VIII. Professor Myres gives us an analysis of the

rising civilization of historic Greece in an endeavor to determine the sources, in the Bronze Age, the Age of Transition, and the contemporary age, of some of its outstanding elements.

This is in brief the outline of an important and stimulating work. Professor Myres writes with a breadth of knowledge, with boldness tempered by caution, and with keen, thoughtful judgment; and he does not lose his sense of direction in the intricacies of complicated argument, although it must be admitted that the book is not always easy reading. He is not afraid to leave a problem unsolved, a question unanswered, when the evidence seems to him insufficient for a solution. As he himself states, it is some gain to have even an obstacle defined.

Naturally one may disagree on some details; and the archæological chapter seems to me to be more open to criticism than the rest of the book. The evidence from the mainland in particular is not given so fully nor so accurately as it deserves, and this is the more to be regretted since it was primarily there that the welding together of the classical Greek race was accomplished. The "painted ware culture" of the Neolithic period, for instance, is not a local phenomenon confined to Thessaly and the North, but is now known to have extended over the whole Greek peninsula far down into Peloponnesus. Early Helladic culture was higher and more distinctive than Professor Myres indicates; and to minimize it by a descriptive term taken from a decadent type of pottery which belongs to the end of its history of nearly a millennium is misleading. Mattpainted ware, which is certainly of more than local significance in the Middle Helladic period, has been almost entirely neglected; some specimens from Aphidna are called "smear ware"; and some from the third stratum at Lianokladhi are dated at least four centuries too late. Not a few of Professor Myres's arguments with reference to conditions on the mainland seem to me thus to be invalidated.

But the chief conclusions of the book are convincingly established, and they mark a notable advance toward a fuller understanding of the problem of the origin of the Greeks and their unique culture.

The University of Cincinnati. CARL W. BLEGEN.

Studies in Mediaeval Culture. By CHARLES HOMER HASKINS, Henry Charles Lea Professor of Mediaeval History in Harvard University. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1929. Pp. viii, 295. $6.00.)

THIS volume consists for the most part of addresses and studies that have already appeared, at various times during the past thirty years, in scholarly journals. Several of them, however, have been thoroughly revised, and there are also three recent studies that have never before appeared in print. Naturally there is a wide range of subject matter and method of presentation in such an anthology of miscellaneous studies. Many of the chapters are of high cultural interest and will attract the general reader. Others are so technical that only the thoroughgoing

medievalist will enjoy them. Those interested in the cultural life and literature of the students, university professors, and royal courts in Italy, France, and Germany will find it worth while to delve deeply into the volume for every chapter contains rare treasure. Chapters I., II., III., and IX. may be considered as a *bloc* of studies dealing with university life. Two of them, Mediaeval Students as Illustrated by their Letters and The University of Paris in the Sermons of the Thirteenth Century, are revisions of former articles that appeared in this journal in 1898 and 1904. The other two are recent studies, hitherto unpublished. That on Manuals for Students describes and illustrates three of the popular types of student handbook of the late Middle Ages. In them, for instance, one might find information of such practical matters as "Methods of selecting professors and courses", "How to give a dinner", etc. Chapter IX., one of the more technical studies of the collection, traces the rise of the new utilitarian rhetoric, that of letter writing (*Ars Dictandi*), in twelfth century Italy, and its spread into France and Germany. The main body of the chapter is a descriptive list of the Italian *Artes Dictandi*, from the earliest instruction books by Alberic of Monte Casino and Albert of Bologna to the middle of the twelfth century. Chapter IV. is a reprint of a paper on The Spread of Ideas in the Middle Ages, read originally before two learned societies and published in *Speculum* (1926). The next three chapters, also, are known to scholars, having appeared in *Speculum* (1927, 1928) and *Isis* (1928). They are concerned chiefly with the literature of the court of Frederick II. The first of them, The Latin Literature of Sport, which was Mr. Haskins's presidential address at the 1927 meeting of the Mediaeval Academy of America, contains extensive quotations from Frederick's own work on falconry. The chapters on Latin Literature under Frederick II. and The *Alchemy* ascribed to Michael Scot (Frederick's astrologer), display more of the apparatus of research than the rest of the studies, with the possible exception of the group of short studies entitled Contacts with Byzantium (ch. VIII.), which is also rather technical in appearance. Chapters X. and XI. exemplify the author's interest in Church history, a field in which he claims to be merely a "gleaner" following afar off in the footsteps of Henry C. Lea. This modest assertion will not, however, minimize the scholarly value of these studies for those who are already familiar with Robert le Bougre and the Beginnings of the Inquisition in Northern France, as it appeared originally in this journal in 1902. The new study (ch. XI.) on The Heresy of Echard the Baker of Rheims sheds further light on one of the difficult problems in this same field. The closing chapter of the volume, consisting of reprints from the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society (1909, 1915), pays high tribute to two American medievalists, Henry C. Lea and Charles Gross.

The University of North Carolina. LOREN C. MACKINNEY.

Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft. Von ERICH CASPAR. Band I., *Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1930. Pp. xv, 633. 32 M.)

"EINE Geschichte des Papsttums soll und will mehr sein als Geschichte der einzelnen Päpste, nämlich Geshichte einer Idee." With this statement of principle Professor Caspar opens the first volume of his history of the papacy from the beginning to the time of Innocent III. An incontrovertible principle, yet if he succeeds in applying it, he will give us something we have never possessed. Ever since the *Liber Pontificalis,* histories of the papacy, unless of the apologetic or brief manual type, have invariably tended to fall apart into lives of individual popes.

Our author goes straight for his subject. The historic Peter, as he calls him, did not dawn on the consciousness of Rome until the third century. Professor Caspar disposes therefore rapidly, though competently, of the Roman bishopric before that time. He has published already a study of the early episcopal lists. When he reaches Callistus, he is still positive that the Roman see was claiming no greater governing authority than others were doing at the time. This in spite of Tertullian's outcry against one who set himself up as "episcopus episcoporum" and the pseudo-Clementine letter to James, which Caspar dates between 220 and 230. He makes Cyprian the unintentional originator of the "primatus Petri" and Stephen the first pope to realize that that conception implied a monarchical supremacy over the federal system of bishops and synods which then composed the church organization.

Thus far the dearth of material makes the story simple. The test of its author comes when he takes up the complicated period that followed Constantine's establishment of yet another kind of church, the "Reichskirche", controlled by the emperor in the interest of the state. But in tracing the vicissitudes of papal fortune through the storm and turmoil of governmental violence and doctrinal controversy, he never for long loses hold of his theme, the struggles of a papacy, growing gradually self-conscious, to express its developing conception of its own character and purpose.

Julius I. he explains as one who tried to ignore the state. The decrees of the Council of Sardica were a bold attempt to construct machinery for judicial appeal to Rome in order to prevent recourse to the emperor. But after the tragedy of Liberius, Damasus adopted different tactics, allying himself with the state to get its aid in extending his autocratic rule over his rivals. Not until the Council of Constantinople, supported by Theodosius, declared the bishop of the new capital next in rank to the Roman bishop did Damasus protest that Rome's authority was religious and not secular and assume for his see the exclusive right to the title "apostolic". Siricius, the author of the first extant decretal, propounded the mystical idea of the indwelling Peter, who himself bore the burden of the heavy-laden in the person of his successors. Innocent I. based his

exercise of judicial and administrative supremacy not on the grants of councils and emperors but on the Scriptural precedent of Jethro and Moses. The triumph of Leo I.'s career was the brief acceptance of the dogmatic leadership of Peter at Chalcedon. His task, as he understood it, was the maintenance of that leadership within the Church and a working understanding with the state. His part in the mission to Attila was hardly more than accidental. His world was still the imperial world of his predecessors, to which invading barbarians did not belong. He was no Gregory I.

The unity of treatment that results from the pursuance of an idea is indeed the distinctive mark of this volume. The danger in writing history from an ideational point of view, the temptation to draw the outline too sharply, to compel the idea to emerge, Professor Caspar seems (in general) to have avoided. He writes ably and vigorously but with fullness and care. The appendix contains an invaluable set of critical bibliographies. A few criticisms may, of course, be made. More use might have been made of legendary and apocryphal materials. Too much stress is sometimes laid on the argument from silence when dealing with periods of which we know next to nothing at best. It is to be hoped that this volume will soon be translated into English.

Wells College. LOUISE R. LOOMIS.

The Economic and Social History of an English Village (Crawley, Hampshire) A.D. 909–1928. By NORMAN SCOTT BRIEN GRAS, Straus Professor of Business History, Harvard University, and ETHEL CULBERT GRAS. [Harvard Economic Studies, volume XXXIV.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1930. Pp. xv, 730. $7.50.)

To this "life history" of an English village, covering its behavior from remote Celtic or Saxon origins to the present time, the authors have brought their wide knowledge of economic history, immense industry and care for detail, and a wealth of illustrative documents and tabulated analyses. It brings to mind in general character and excellence Miss Davenport's *Norfolk Manor,* that mainstay of manorial history, but covers a much longer period of time and has many more documents. It has not, however, so satisfactory a map. The village chosen is Crawley in Hampshire, near Winchester, forming part of the estate of the bishop of Winchester from the days of the Saxons until taken over by the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1869. It belonged in medieval times to that class of manors which is sometimes designated as typical—that is to say, it had customary tenants with tenements conforming to certain uniform types, it had open fields, it received week work and boon work on the demesne, customary rents, and attendance at courts from its tenants, and it had the usual, although in this case not very full or interesting, arrangements for pasture and estovers. In addition, however, it had two im-

portant and unusual characteristics: cradle hold or borough English, the succession of the youngest son of customary tenants to the inheritance, and a curious twofold division of the village into North Crawley, on one side of the village street, inhabited by bondmen with small holdings of ten or eleven acres called farthinglands, and South Crawley, on the other side of the street, inhabited by customary tenants with holdings of virgates or half virgates. The authors suggest in explanation of this division that North Crawley was in origin a Celtic village, but there is little evidence beyond the small holdings of the tenants. Miss Davenport, too, it may be remembered, found in her village a connection between "the distribution of dwellings and the status of the population". It is a matter which is well worth further investigation.

Throughout the long unrolling of Crawley's history through the centuries, the authors keep almost exclusively to the presentation of their subject as an economic unit. They are able to endow it with a certain personality, and we too acquire friendly interest in its affairs. We pass from the height of manorialism in the thirteenth century—although in passing we may well question the definition of a manor—through the commutation of week work, the renting of parts of the home farm, the commutation of other services, the change to copyhold, of which we gain little information, and, very clearly presented, the "rise of personal freedom, the development of a market for land, the incoming of gentlemen lessees, the enclosure of the land", the decline of the courts, and the sifting of the old customary tenants into two classes, yeoman farmers holding bondland and leasehold, and cottagers with an hereditary claim on their homes. An interesting table shows the derivation of various classes of tenants. The history ends with the "new manorialism" of modern times.

The long introduction is followed by documents and tables, each document preceded by a commentary. The kinds of material include charters, reeves' accounts beginning in 1208, customals, subsidies, leases, accounts of farmers of the demesne, presentations at courts of the fifteenth and later centuries (but no court rolls), fines, surrenders of land, wills, musters, excerpts from parish registers, from churchwarden accounts and poor books, the enclosure act, an enclosure award, tithe documents, and the census. There are, in addition, nearly one hundred and fifty pages of statistics. In all, the volume reaches the inordinate length of 702 pages, not counting the index! Contrary to the practice adopted by scholars like Mr. G. J. Turner and Mr. Plucknett whose editing is a counsel of perfection, the editors print in italics the letters supposedly indicated by the mark of contraction. Unless the mark of contraction itself is also reproduced, even this meticulousness can not give the reader exact knowledge of the suggestion of the original manuscript, and the combination of different forms of type is very annoying and wearying to the eye.

Two drawbacks, closely related, necessarily accompany a work on the plan here adopted. The editors can not go far afield; their village is almost necessarily studied in isolation, and the full light of minute and

special knowledge and modern investigation can not well be thrown on the phenomena of so many centuries. The reader interested in a particular period or subject will inevitably regret the lack of further commentary on specific points—on church-scot, cradle hold, fixed rents, rights of common in downland manors, for example in the medieval period. We may wonder also whether Mr. Corbett was not right in preferring Domesday valuation to hidation as a guide to the size and importance of manors, and wish for a citation from the Year Books on the probability of two courts, the tourn and the court baron, being considered as one unit. Very valuable as a study like this of Crawley undoubtedly is, it yet fills only part of our need for local histories. There is still a place of great importance for studies of villages or groups of villages as they were at special periods, and of their characteristics in relation to those of other villages in the same region.

Mount Holyoke College. N. Neilson.

Recherches sur le Commerce Génois dans la Mer Noire au XIII^e^ Siècle. Par G. I. Bratianu, Professeur à l'Université de Jassy. (Paris: Paul Geuthner. 1929. Pp. xii, 356. 75 fr.)

This is a book which should be of deep interest not only to those particularly concerned with the history of Byzantium or of Genoa, as the title might indicate, but to all students of medieval commerce. Professor Bratianu, delving deeply into the Genoese notarial archives, has risen high above the mass of material he found there, confusing as it tends to become in its wealth of detail, and then by a wide sweep over many other sources, through a very broad reading of the works of scores of scholars in almost as many lands, has achieved the perspective at which he aimed.

The first book in two chapters deals with commerce in the Black Sea in antiquity and in the early Middle Ages, and with the first expansion of the Genoese in the Levant. The second book devotes a chapter to the Genoese establishments in Constantinople and in Pera; another to the commerce of the Genoese in the Byzantine Empire; a third to the commerce with the eastern shores of the Black Sea; a fourth to the beginnings of the Genoese colonies in the Crimea; a fifth to the war with Venice at the end of the thirteenth century and the resultant new conditions governing the trade in the following century. There follow a conclusion, an interesting appendix digressing with apparent authoritative statement to the disputed country of Lac mentioned by Marco Polo, and a second appendix of twenty-two documents drawn by Genoese notaries for the most part in the East. Readers of the volume should note, however, that in an earlier volume (*Actes des Notaires Génois de Péra et de Caffa de la Fin du Treizième Siècle, 1281–1290*) Professor Bratianu has given us *in extenso* 333 documents drawn by Genoese notaries in Pera and Caffa, and in the form of *regesta* 455 others, with an analytical introduction of seventy-one pages. It is largely from the documents edited in the earlier volume that the chapters on commerce in the volume under review have

been drawn. The reviewer regards it as an unfortunate mistake in judgment that the two volumes were not published as one work, throwing into the chapters on commerce in the present volume the valuable material presented in the introduction to the earlier one.

The chapters covering the background, the geographical setting, the diplomacy, the course of actual events, would carry the reader back to Heyd were his name never mentioned, and Bratianu sometimes surpasses Heyd in quick sure sweeps over intricately interwoven motives and actions. But turning to the very chapters in which one hopes to find the finest fruits of the author's researches in the Genoese documentary material, the reader meets with disappointment until he reverts to the introduction to the earlier volume. An illustration or two may suffice. The reader begins a passage on weights and measures (pp. 121–127), always a troublesome question to the worker in the field, to find no more than Pegolotti has given us, whereas he had hoped that from the documents used the blanks left by Pegolotti might be filled, perhaps some of his discrepancies solved. Passing to the paragraphs on the monies used (pp. 121–127), the reader hopes to secure light on the vexed question of exchange and of interest, only to meet with some confusion, some inaccuracy in statement and in reference, followed by a superficial explanatory passage leading finally to a reference to the introduction in the earlier volume where the subject is treated at greater length to be sure, but not so exhaustively as is warranted by the sources available to the author and actually presented by him in his documents. However, Professor Bratianu has presented problems for himself and others to solve in the course of the contributions he has made. His conclusion alone, of six pages, is a noteworthy presentation of an interesting point of view of medieval economic problems, as well as a convincing rejoinder to those of Sombart's theories which always appear unsound to the worker in Genoese notarial documents.

The University of Wisconsin. EUGENE H. BYRNE.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Aus Antwerpener Notariatsarchiven: Quellen zur Deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Von JAKOB STRIEDER, o. Professor der Wirtschaftsgeschichte an der Universität München. [*Deutsche Handelsakten des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, herausgegeben durch die Historische Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Band IV.] (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1930. Pp. xxxix, 480. 20 M.)

THE distinguished professor of economic history in the University of Munich, who already has five notable volumes dealing with the economic history of the later Middle Ages and early modern epoch to his credit,

has made every student of this subject again his debtor by publication of this series of documents. The value of notarial records as sources of commercial history is a discovery of recent years. Blancard's *Recueil de Documents relatifs au Commerce de Marseille* (2 vols., 1884–1885) was a pioneer in this respect. Since then one might enumerate a long list of works primarily based upon notarial sources. The volume of such sources available to the historian and still unexplored may be indicated when it is said that the archives of the Haute-Garonne alone possess over three hundred notarial registers.

This work abstracts or presents in complete text 813 separate documents extracted from the archives of Antwerp and Lille ranging in date from 1525 to 1588. It is apparent that these evidences cast new light upon trade as an international factor, as for example, the interest of the Hansers in recovering their old supremacy in England by promoting the Spanish match of Queen Mary. In unraveling the mixed threads of diplomacy and commerce some revelations in this volume supplement the *Calendar of State Papers, Spain,* edited by Mr. Royall Tyler, although, of course, the "higher ups" are seldom mentioned.

The Hansers had been so long established in Bruges that they never were able to feel at home in Antwerp when the decline of Bruges made removal to Antwerp imperative, and consequently failed to keep pace with the Dutch and English merchants there. On the other hand South German merchants, who never had been caught in the meshes of either the Hanseatic League or any other similar association, having had more freedom of action in the past, were able successfully to make the readjustment. This was observed as far back as 1896 by Ehrenberg, and is amply sustained herein. Thus we find the Höchstetter, rivals of the Fuggers as metal kings of the sixteenth century—the Guggenheims of the time—the Fuggers, the Welsers (all hailing from Augsburg) much in evidence in Antwerp. The same observation is true of Nuremberger and Ulmer merchants, but Regensburger merchants are few. It is strange, however, that amid all these documents one does not come upon the trail of that other German metal magnate, Count Volrad of Mansfeld, with whom Sir Thomas Gresham had such a tussle in 1560. The loss of Calais to England in 1558 does not seem greatly to have perturbed commerce, and apparently may be discounted as an important event in economic history in the sixteenth century. But it is not without interest that in the days of the Holy League Spanish merchants began pushing in there. These documents are also valuable sources for the European colonial trade both in East and West. Africa, the East Indies, the West Indies, Brazil, Peru, crop up time and again as one runs through the pages. The Welsers were heavily interested in Venezuela and Chile. The index is an *Orts- und Namenregister* only. It is unfortunate that there is not an *index rerum,* especially for commodities and business terms of the time. In compensation for omission to compile a list of business terms Professor Strieder refers the reader to Alfred Schirmer's *Wörterbuch der Deutschen Kauf-*

mannssprache auf Geschichtlicher Grundlage (Strassburg, 1911), which may be an unfamiliar title to some readers of this review. Most of these documents are in Flemish, but there are many in Latin, Low German, French, and Dutch.

The University of Chicago. JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge. Von BERNHARD DUHR, S. J. Band IV., *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge im 18. Jahrhundert.* (Munich-Regensburg: G. J. Manz. 1928. Pp. ix, 515; vi, 606. 60 M.)

To the end Father Duhr's work shows the qualities that make it a model—thoroughness, exactness, sincerity. This final volume, though it breaks off sharply in 1773 with the Bull of suspension, is published in two parts. The first, with its statistics of each of the German provinces and missions, may serve best for reference; but the more discursive second has a wider interest. It deals with Jesuit schools and studies in the eighteenth century, with the school drama, with Jesuit writers and preachers, with the nurture of popular devotion by missions and spiritual exercises, sodalities and books of worship, with the work of the Jesuits in the armies and among the poor, with their rôle at the German courts and the changing habits of their own houses, with the share of German Jesuits in the missions beyond sea and their fate when Spain and Portugal proscribed the order. A closing chapter, *Im Urteil der Zeit*, gathers verdicts from friend and foe as to their merits in these last decades and the justice of their suppression. No such proof is needed that to most who then gave judgment the order merited blind hate or love as blind. More solid vindication it finds in Father Duhr's well-buttressed chapters on its activities, though it must be admitted that his consciousness of this lends an apologetic flavor to his volume.

Nowhere is this more evident than in the one chapter not yet mentioned—that on "new witch-burnings". The witch persecution so general in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century was worst in Germany, and so great was the share in it of Jesuit writers and advisers, whether as advocates or as opponents, that from the first Father Duhr has given it attention; and nobody has shown as has he how deeply, despite the deprecation of the superiors, this question divided the order. In the eighteenth century, when the delusion was everywhere else on the wane, but still lived on in Catholic Germany, he is able to show the Jesuits in eastern Prussia helping to check the popular credulity; but he loyally narrates, too, their connection with the last witch execution that stirred wide interest in Europe—that of the highborn nun Maria Renata, subprioress of the convent of Unter-Zell at Würzburg, in 1749. It was a Jesuit, Father Gaar, who then harangued the crowd in exposition of her crime, and, printing his discourse, led the forces of reaction in the literary controversy that ensued. Nor is Duhr content with setting over into his

volume what he has told of the episode in his study on "the attitude of the Jesuits in the German witch-trials" (Cologne, 1900). He sifts it now afresh, using the monograph of Memminger (*Das Verhexte Kloster*, Würzburg, 1904, revised in 1908), and does not fail to point out with severity how in their advice the Jesuit theologians of the Würzburg faculty forget their order's more humane writers and cite only the credulous, opening the door to every cruelty. But there was more to be told. Already in 1858 a local investigator, Gätschenberger, having access to "the original trial-record", published in his *Zwei Klostergeschichten* enlightening details, such as the "twenty-five lashes with a consecrated rawhide"[1] which first extorted confession from the nun. Johannes Scherr, who in the 'seventies again quoted, in the later editions of his *Deutsche Kultur- und Sittengeschichte* and in his *Hammerschläge und Historien*, "the documents of this trial", which, he says, "a fortunate accident" has brought into his possession, and Memminger, who used, Duhr tells us, the records treasured at Würzburg by the Historical Society of Lower Franconia, have added much and reveal the presence of saner counselors, who at least fended off an epidemic of further witch trials.

The share of the Jesuits in the affair was smaller than their foes have made it—save as they then were responsible for the intellectual atmosphere of Würzburg. The serious count against them is that such reaction seems now—and not in this domain of thought alone—to have become their chronic attitude. Against the bumptious rationalism of that age they were the spokesmen of tradition. Do they perhaps owe to the suspension that again they are so largely mediators between devotion and advancing thought?

Cornell University. GEORGE L. BURR.

[1] The German word is *Karbatsche* (koorbash, knout)—"consecrated" for use, of course, in convent discipline. This implement, then just making its way from the Orient, was central in the new "Bamberg torture", lauded in the torture chambers for its persuasiveness. If Memminger has not put hand again on this piece of evidence, he has confirmed it by what the nun told her confessor. But documents still unused must not be left unmentioned: parts of her trial (fifty or sixty folio pages) have been since 1899 in the White collection at Cornell. They were then bought in Germany by Ambassador White from the estate of the eminent Bamberg librarian, Dr. Friedrich Leitschuh (1837–1898), into whose hands they must have come after his own booklet on Franconian witch persecution (1883) had left the press. They include her first confession (Feb. 5, 7, 8, 1749), twice signed by her in autograph; and, though this, of course, mentions no constraint, it is eloquent of it to the student of witch confessions. That in the secular trial that followed her disfrocking she was, despite her birth, her age (she was sixty-nine), her broken health, made to face the usual tortures seems implied; but two referees in their opinions, among these papers, advise against a further torture to reveal accomplices. That she was really culpable of aught is hard to reconcile with the charge of her superior and arch-accuser, Abbot Loschert, that her apparently blameless life was only a trick to hide her pact with Satan. Of his well-known narrative there came with these papers a contemporary transcript with variant readings and two added pages.

Histoire des Colonies Françaises et de l'Expansion de la France dans le Monde. Publiée sous la direction de GABRIEL HANOTAUX de l'Académie Française et ALFRED MARTINEAU, Professeur au Collège de France. Tome I., *Introduction Générale,* par GABRIEL HANOTAUX; *L'Amérique,* par CH. DE LA RONCIÈRE, Conservateur à la Bibliothèque Nationale, JOANNÈS TRAMOND, Professeur à l'École Navale, ÉMILE LAUVRIÈRE, Professeur au Lycée Louis-le-Grand. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1930. Pp. xlviii, 630. 150 fr.)

M. GABRIEL HANOTAUX has only recently completed the editing of the fifteen volumes of the history of the French nation and now, published in the same style, we have the first of six volumes on the French colonies edited by M. Hanotaux in collaboration with M. Alfred Martineau of the Collège de France. This volume, dealing with French effort in America, will be followed by two on North Africa and the Near East, one on West and Equatorial Africa, one on Madagascar and the Pacific and Indian Seas, and one on India and Indo-China. The work parallels the elaborate Cambridge history of the British colonial empire, but with a difference. The Cambridge volumes have elaborate references to authorities and no illustrations. Each is a solid book of reference. M. Hanotaux's volume, apart from his own introduction, is without reference to authorities and is pleasantly illustrated with eight colored plates by M. Charles Sanlaville, some three hundred charming drawings in black by M. G. Repart, and half a dozen maps. Clearly the book is intended for the general reader and the lucidity of style should attract him.

In the forty-eight pages of introduction M. Hanotaux lets himself go, if one may be colloquial, on the glories of France as the chief civilizing force of the Christian Era. French authors idealize France in a manner that they would regard as provincial if followed by British or American writers on their own countries. M. Hanotaux sums up France's task: "propagande de justice parmi les peuples civilisés, expansion de civilisation chez les peuples attardés. Ses moyens d'action sont toujours les mêmes: le charme, la bonne grace, la douceur des moeurs, l'hospitalité accueillante, l'accroissement du bien-être pour tous, la modération dans la fortune, la souplesse dans les mouvements, le goût du beau, du juste, que sais-je? les arts, la mode, le sourire" (p. xlvii).

Virtue is not always rewarded and, in spite of these noble aims, the story of France in America, told in this volume, is one of melancholy failure. France, that at one time claimed the whole of North America, lost Canada, Acadia, Louisiana, and all that she has now are two petty islands off Newfoundland, the homes of a few fishermen and, since prohibition was adopted in the United States, the center, like the British Bahamas, of a thriving trade in the forbidden fruit. In the West Indies, to which France sent more Frenchmen than she sent to Canada, she lost her fine colony of Santo Domingo through the revolt of the negroes and

now has only Martinique and Guadeloupe and a few smaller islands. In South America where she planned a great empire she has now only the malarial area of French Guiana.

M. Hanotaux does not fail to inquire into the causes of these gigantic failures. They are not due to any defect in the French capacity to colonize: modern Canada and Louisiana are monuments of French tenacity and adaptability. The causes of the failure are intricate. Just as the colonizing era began France was crippled by prolonged civil wars about religion. She lacked something in her outlook on trade. While English and Dutch trading companies succeeded, the French uniformly failed, whether through too strong a spirit of monopoly, or through undue interference by the state, or to lack of capacity in competition, it is not easy now to say. One cause of failure to colonize was that, like M. Hanotaux, the French idealize France and are reluctant to go elsewhere. Probably fewer than ten thousand French are the ancestors of the three millions now in North America, fewer than two hundred were the ancestors of the Acadians whose descendants in Canada and Louisiana now number hundreds of thousands.

Nothing in the story of France is finer than that of the adventurous spirits who, prompted by both religious zeal and the love of action, faced the perils and the martyrdom of exploring North America. The English can show little to equal it; but, they went out in great numbers to the commonplace tasks of farmers and traders, they took root deeply, and in the day of conflict they were the stronger. France had one crushing handicap. She was in danger of being encircled in Europe by the House of Austria and she sacrificed effort on the sea to security on land. This left maritime supremacy to England. It is interesting to note that a modern Germany, also believing herself encircled in Europe, has suffered a similar fate in the colonial field.

In the present volume the section on Brazil, Florida, and Canada is treated by M. Charles de la Roncière down to 1713 and by M. Joannès Tramond for the intervening period to the British Conquest. Both authors are experts in the naval matters that involved success or failure in the colonial field. M. Émile Lauvrière writes the history of France in Acadia and in Louisiana. The passion in his earlier work on the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia makes his partiality suspect. He has not the detachment shown by Mr. J. B. Brebner in his recent admirable work on this outpost of New England. We should hardly learn from M. Lauvrière's narration that the Acadians had any of those frailties that the rest of mankind does not escape. His account of both Acadia and Louisiana has, however, real value. He explains the settlement of Acadians in Louisiana during the Spanish régime after the Peace of 1763 and the result that the most important French element in Louisiana at the present time is of Acadian origin. His narrative of events in Louisiana is admirably lucid. There was incessant strife among the French leaders, not unlike that in Canada in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Lack of space forbids more than mention of the half of the book dealing with the West Indies. M. de la Roncière writes on the period before the Treaty of Utrecht, M. Tramond on that after it. The treaty marks the beginning of the end of French empire in America. The dramatic story centers in the great colony of Santo Domingo, next to Canada France's chief effort at colonization overseas, lost, unhappily for itself, by the upheaval of the Revolution. The book tells the story of France in America with dramatic effect. This, and not research, is its merit.

The University of Toronto. GEORGE M. WRONG.

The Cambridge History of the British Empire. Edited by J. HOLLAND ROSE, M.A., LITT.D., Vere Harmsworth Professor of Naval History in the University of Cambridge, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, A. P. NEWTON, M.A., D.LIT., Rhodes Professor of Imperial History in the University of London, Fellow of King's College, London, and E. A. BENIANS, M.A., Fellow and Senior Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge. Volume VI. *Canada and Newfoundland.* Adviser for the Dominion of Canada, W. P. M. KENNEDY, M.A., LITT.D., Professor of Law in the University of Toronto. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xxi, 939. $9.50.)

THIS excellent volume is the work of thirty-three contributors. It is a significant comment on the development of historical scholarship in Canada in recent years that twenty-eight are Canadian scholars. Only three of the thirty-six chapters deal with Newfoundland, that "essentially amphibious society" which was the prey of diplomatists for several centuries, but they are among the most interesting in the volume and occasionally take issue with Prowse's earlier, standard work. As far as the history of the Canadian Dominion is concerned, over half of the volume deals with the period since confederation, a notable and altogether commendable new departure in Canadian historiography. A somewhat fairer allotment of space also has been made for the maritime region. The plan of the book is chronological and unitary, and provincial history is subordinated to the larger sweep of events from the earliest days of discovery to 1921, the date line beyond which few contributors have ventured to go. Four chapters have been included on economic history, and one on cultural development, and Sir Robert A. Falconer's vivid treatment of The Pioneering Spirit deserves special mention. But the main emphasis is on political and constitutional development rather than on "the new history". The book is well edited and duplication has been reduced to a minimum. Some chapters contain valuable footnotes; others are entirely without this helpful apparatus of historical scholarship.

In reviewing so large an undertaking, it is practically impossible to comment fairly on the work of individual contributors. Three Canadian

scholars, McArthur, Morison, and Wallace, each have three chapters to their credit; three others, Trotter, Martin, and Falconer have each contributed two chapters. Worthy of special commendation is Professor [illegible]t's excellent chapter on the years 1760–1774, years that "laid the foundations of French-Canadian trust in the justice of British rule", and have not always received the attention they deserve; Professor Fryer's brilliant pages on Papineau, and Professor Morison's chapter on the period from 1815 to 1837. Professors Trotter and Martin were the logical choices for the confederation period and the maritimes, respectively, and their chapters are happy summaries of their earlier work. Judge Howay did the chapter on British Columbia, and Professor Kennedy has made a clear statement of the working of the Canadian constitution.

Among so many contributors, it is relatively easy for a reviewer to find material for disagreement. Perhaps the only serious criticism to be offered is that in several chapters too much information is taken for granted which only a specialist can be expected to possess, and occasionally, important details have been overlooked. For example, it is curious to find the Manitoba schools question discussed without a single clear reference to the educational clauses of the British North America Act. Laurier's interest in reciprocity in 1911 is nowhere clearly related to the Canadian farmers' revolt which certainly was an important factor in persuading the Liberals to "steer west" on the tariff. Tupper, in 1896, did not accept "the inevitable", without first trying to pack senate and courts with Conservatives; and the discussion of the building of the Canadian Northern, by those "daring and ingenious railway builders" (p. 516), Mann and Mackenzie, gives little clew to their operations in the realm of "high finance". The coöperative movement is discussed without mentioning T. A. Crerar; there is no hint of a controversy over prohibition in Canada; and hydro-electric power is treated without a word about Sir Adam Beck. It would have been only logical to carry the story of imperial relations to the notable Conference of 1926, instead of stopping short with 1921. The controversy in Ontario over bilingualism and separate schools had perhaps as much to do with public opinion in Quebec on the eve of the Great War as any other factor, and in the discussion of the acts by which the electorate was gerrymandered during the war in the interests of the pro-war party, Colonel Wood says much about *en*franchisement, but nothing about *dis*franchisement. Finally, in the light of the work of the revisionists and the muddle of Versailles, is it not a little too ironical to continue to refer to the War of 1914 as "this freeman's war"?

These minor criticisms must not be permitted to obscure the fact that here is a most scholarly and readable work, the most exhaustive and best one volume treatment of the history of British North America. It is a credit to the excellent series to which it belongs, and brings fresh laurels to a brilliant group of Canadian scholars. The bibliography covering seventy-two pages, is the most complete bibliography of Canadian history

available anywhere in convenient form. Part I., compiled by Dr. Doughty, lists the manuscript sources and archival material. Part II., dealing with printed works, owes much to the careful and painstaking efforts of Dr. Trotter.

The Ohio State University. CARL WITTKE.

New Light on the Discovery of Australia, as revealed by the Journal of Captain Don Diego de Prado y Tovar. Edited by HENRY N. STEVENS, M.A., F.R.G.S., with annotated translations from the Spanish by GEORGE F. BARWICK, B.A., Keeper of Printed Books, British Museum, 1914–1919. (London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1930. Pp. xii, 261. 18s.)

A veritable delight this—not alone because of the gratification it affords in offering material that clears up a mystery of long standing touching the reputed Spanish discovery of Australia, but because of the fine scholarship it displays from the beginning to the end of the volume. The editor's foreword tells us what to expect. It is his presentation of "Prado's *Relación* and other new and important material relating to Quiros". The *Relación,* not the original; for, unfortunately, the whereabouts of that still remains unknown, but a copy, which was evidently the work of Captain Don Diego de Prado y Tovar himself, was found among miscellaneous Spanish manuscripts that had been collected by the late Sir Thomas Phillips after the same had been disposed of by auction and a portion acquired by Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. How Henry N. Stevens came to be selected to edit the *Relación* for publication need not detain us. Suffice it that "forty years' practical experience in examining, collating, abstracting, and describing old historical manuscripts" would seem to have made him eminently qualified and so the result attests. The translation of the *Relación,* which appears here also, was undertaken by another highly trained specialist, George F. Barwick, of the British Museum. Together these two scholars have given the historical world a product that leaves little to be desired, so painstaking have they been, so exhaustive in their researches, so illuminating in their analyses and annotations.

The *Relación* is Prado's own story of what his relations were with Quiros and with Torres and of what was actually accomplished by that memorable expedition of which all three formed a part; and, should doubt arise in the reader's mind as to Prado's credibility in view of the unfavorable opinion that has hitherto obtained concerning him, the other documents here edited, when taken in conjunction with some things previously known and vouched for, will be found fully corroborative. Prado was no mutinous sailor. Rather was he an explorer, devoted to the service of king and country, intent upon seeing that orders issued were carried out and a trust imposed honestly performed. The unfaithful servant was Quiros, the commander, and against him and his conduct

the entire crew was almost in revolt. To register his own dissatisfaction and yet at the same time to avoid being selected as the head of dissentient ones, Prado, with the consent of Quiros, transferred himself to the ship of Torres and was there welcomed. Later, after the commander's ship had parted company with its fellow and had been waited for in vain, a surprising thing happened and this is where the *Relación* gives us absolutely new information; for, "under sealed orders opened at the Island of Espiritu Santo", the command of the expedition devolved upon Prado with Torres as navigating captain. It was Prado, therefore, who took it to its conclusion, although not exactly in the way the orders had directed, he being "compelled by stress of weather to sail along the south coast" of New Guinea instead "of passing to the north". "To that fortuitous circumstance", says the editor, "we owe not only the discovery of the tortuous passage between New Guinea and Australia (now known as Torres Strait) but incidentally the first definite discovery of Australia itself", this, upon the assumption, that the discovery of islands in close proximity to a mainland is equivalent to the discovery of the latter.

How much maligned Prado has been, how great, in the absence of specific knowledge, has been the misconception regarding the part he played is amazing. And the deplorable thing is that Sir Clements Markham, whose repute as a trustworthy scholar has been heretofore unassailed, seems to have been in no slight degree responsible. To Markham's otherwise most estimable work, *The Voyages of Pedro Fernandez de Quiros*, published by the Hakluyt Society, the edited *Relación* of Prado is, of necessity, a sequel and has been made to conform to it in size, instead of being printed in facsimile, which, under other circumstances, would have greatly enhanced its interest and value. The illustrations, which include contemporary maps and a reduced facsimile of the first and the last page of Prado's duplicate *Relación*, are a noteworthy feature and the sketch maps in the cover pocket are especially so, the one being "deduced from dates, latitudes and places mentioned by Prado in his Relación or by Torres in his letter", the same that is of date, July, 1607, and published here in an entirely new and more accurate translation.

Aberdeen, Washington. ANNIE HELOISE ABEL-HENDERSON.

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy. Volume XXIX., 1653–1654; volume XXX., 1655–1656. Edited by ALLEN B. HINDS, M.A. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1929; 1930. Pp. xlix, 393; l, 416. 30 s. each.)

THE *Calendars of State Papers, Venetian*, 1653–1654, and 1655–1656, have for their major source the reports of the Signory's officers in London, Paulucci, Sagredo, and Giavarina, and for themes the Dutch War, the Spanish War, and the political unrest in England under the Commonwealth and Protectorate governments.

Venice kept to no settled policy in designating representatives to the court of England during this period. Sagredo who served the middle term, and had already been ambassador to France, was given the full title of ambassador, but Paulucci and Giavarina were no more than secretary and resident, despite their own protests, the advice of Sagredo, and the wishes of the English government. It was, however, these two lesser officers who performed their duties most efficiently, and who, keeping to the high standards of earlier Venetian ambassadors to England, sent home lively reports. For Sagredo the period of service in England was a time of continual misfortunes, of which not the least was the "damp and most extraordinary climate".

In one point all of them were aware that their work was deficient. The unusual secrecy with which the English government conducted its business put upon them the burden of supplying authentic news—or news that sounded authentic—from the most diverse sources. All boasted from time to time, as though to justify their existence, of the favor of influential friends at court, and on one occasion (XXX. 235), Giavarina, having said that a certain meeting was so closely conducted that one could learn nothing about it, filled out a paragraph with information of its proceedings, but commonly they were content to retail the gossip of the streets, to choose among rumors, or to repeat the "mitigated" news which the government saw fit to publish.

What they learned taught them to respect the power, energy, and skill of Cromwell, "autocrat of the three kingdoms", a man "whom fortune and industry have rendered the most famous of the present age", and, though they charted the deeps and shallows of his popularity, none of them doubted that the system of government which he directed would last as long as he lived. Lack of full knowledge made their criticism of Cromwellian policy uncertain, but their experience of politics helped them to bring into perspective the larger problems of the English government, and to strike off such generalizations as that of Sagredo who said that Cromwell began the war with Spain "to keep his troops (navy) employed, his enemies alarmed, and the people in expectation", or that of Paulucci who was writing, as early as September, 1653, that between England and Holland, England "will always be the predominant nation".

In his introductions to the two volumes, Mr. Hinds has been satisfied, as have earlier editors of the *Calendars*, to do no more than summarize, in a formal way, the more salient reports of news and statements of opinion, without commenting upon the accuracy and historical value of what was written by the officers of the Signory. In consequence, too much prominence is given to secondhand news, and not enough to the personal expressions of opinion which the officers rightly deemed most important, and therefore transposed into cipher. A further deficiency of the introduction to volume XXIX. is that in summarizing Paulucci's reports its gives too sharp a focus to them, and disregards the "possiblys" and "I fancys" with which he continually protected himself. (*Cf.* doc. 309 with the comment on p. xxviii; doc. 50, and p. xviii.)

Cornell University. F. G. MARCHAM.

Blenheim: England under Queen Anne. By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN, O.M., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1930. Pp. xii, 477. $7.50.)

"FOR MY PART", says Professor Trevelyan in the preface to this first volume of his projected history of England under Queen Anne, "I cannot abandon the older ideal of History once popular in England, that the same book should make its appeal both to the general reader and to the historical student." By this confession of faith and also by his choice of the period following the death of William III., at which point Macaulay laid down his pen, the grandnephew of Macaulay adheres to the honorable traditions of his house. Not that Professor Trevelyan, a distinguished historian in his own right, has proposed to imitate Macaulay in technique or in style. Indeed, in dissenting from his predecessor's estimate of Marlborough, he takes occasion to point out the strength and the weakness of Macaulay as an historian: his genius for building up and making clear a general situation; his failure to understand character and motives. But Macaulay made the age of the Revolution live for his readers, and Professor Trevelyan would do the same in his history of the age of Anne. This first volume, which covers the years 1700 to 1704, is eminently lucid and readable; it is quietly rather than brilliantly written, dramatic effects being avoided. Stress is laid on the sincerities which found expression in the raucous battle-cries of Whigs and Tories, and Professor Trevelyan finds a broad charity for the violence and excesses of men and women who lived in the uncertainties of these years. Even the lapses of Tory ministers into Jacobite treason are to him a natural result of the shock of the Revolution to deep-rooted loyalties. Perhaps the picture is a little idyllic, the wild hatreds of the time too far off-stage. But only a very hard-hearted critic will resist the charm of the opening chapters in which the state of England in the opening years of the eighteenth century, before the Industrial Revolution had swept over it, is affectionately described. "And what men that little rustic England could breed! A nation of five and a half millions that had Wren for its architect, Newton for its scientist, Locke for its philosopher, Bentley for its scholar, Pope for its satirist, Addison for its essayist, Bolingbroke for its orator, Swift for its pamphleteer and Marlborough to win its battles, had the recipe for genius" (p. vii). Of these first few years of Queen Anne's reign in which "all roads . . . foreign and domestic, lead to Blenheim", Marlborough is the inscrutable hero. His rehabilitation has not awaited Professor Trevelyan's pen, but we find fuller acknowledgment than heretofore of non-military qualities that, unrecognized by his time, were an essential part of his greatness. Poor Queen Anne receives a kind word, as is, indeed, the recent habit of historians, for her steadfastness and "good sense shading off into stupidity", which made her "not at all ill-suited to fill the throne after William". In his treatment of the party situation, Professor Trevelyan is in accord with the views expressed by

Mr. Keith Feiling in his fine *History of the Tory Party*. The simplifications which are, perhaps, a necessary concession to the general reader, though considerations of space may have induced them, have made somewhat elementary the explanation of the political problems arising out of the Spanish Succession. The economic aspects of these problems are only slightly touched upon, but they will probably receive attention in a later volume. The work merits a warm welcome, especially from the luckless wights who, endowed by nature with an interest in history, look up and are not fed by the historians' history on the one hand, or the welter of psychology and impressionism which passes for the new biography, on the other.

Vassar College. VIOLET BARBOUR.

The Social and Political Ideas of some Great French Thinkers of the Age of Reason. A series of Lectures delivered at King's College, University of London, during the session 1928–1929. Edited by F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of King's College and Professor of Mediaeval History in the University of London. (New York: F. S. Crofts Company. 1930. Pp. 251. $3.50.)

IT is always tempting to challenge the editor's choice in a selective work of this kind. In this particular volume, one wonders why Bayle should have been omitted when Bossuet, Fénelon, and the Abbé de Saint Pierre were included; why Diderot was not placed alongside of Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau; why the Physiocrats should not have been put on an equal footing with their critics Helvétius and Holbach, Morellet and Mably. The omissions are all the more notable because these men were more likely to have spoken from actual experience than from sheer hypothesis; Diderot observed the industries he described, and the Physiocrats managed their own farms.

The inclusion of Bossuet and Fénelon is explained as marking the transition between the old and the new. To be sure, none of the *philosophes* were so devoted to the idea of benevolent despotism as Bossuet and Fénelon (unless it was the slighted Physiocrats). But the transition was not so sudden as the authors imply. The eighteenth century in France exhibits a three-cornered conflict; the king, sometimes in alliance with the nobility and sometimes in alliance with the bourgeoisie, fights to maintain his absolutism, while his alternating allies fight for control of the throne. Montesquieu, along with Bossuet and Fénelon, was a champion of the nobility. The *Esprit des Lois* is the last important plea for the restriction of royal absolutism by political machinery under the direction of the nobility. After that the turn of the middle class came with Voltaire, Diderot, Helvétius, and Mably (despite his communes and speculations), and then the inning of the near-democrats with Rousseau and the men who were later to be Jacobins. Fénelon presents no more contrast to Montesquieu than Montesquieu to Rousseau.

The excellent introductory chapter by Mr. Laski, which presents an otherwise splendid survey of the entire Age of Reason, fails to point out this growing radicalism of eighteenth century political thought. And the method of the following lectures, in which the entire output of the thinker in question is examined as if it issued from a single sitting and presented a consistent philosophy, does nothing to show how these men, as they grew older, changed their minds. Voltaire's religion is treated as if it were a constant, unchanging belief (pp. 154–156), though Voltaire, who knew very decidedly what he did not believe, never was altogether sure of what he did believe. One would never guess from the carefully pigeonholed analysis of Rousseau's ideas (pp. 187–193), despite the earlier and entirely fair warning of his contradictory nature (pp. 183–186), that Rousseau was one of the most inconsistent persons of his day, writing now theoretically and again practically, pleading the beauty of the state of nature to-day and the justice of a social compact tomorrow, advocating a gentle tolerance in one book and refusing minority rights in another, both published in the same year. Voltaire changed his mind as he grew older; Rousseau changed his mind according to the particular purpose at hand. Why should we expect of these men a consistency we neither expect nor want in contemporaries?

A history of eighteenth century thought should some day be written which would take up the story not man by man, or even school by school, but generation by generation. I suspect it will then be found that the *philosophes*, not because they created feeling, but because they reflected it as did the rest of the world around them, tended more and more toward revolution and, to use an anachronism, toward the left. The present volume does not deny this (except *en passant*, pp. 21 and 36), but from the way it is organized one never sees the seething volcano that threatened several times to erupt before it finally covered the world with flame and ashes. It is a competent study, not of some French thinkers, but of some French thoughts. Each lecture (and particularly R. A. Jones's on Fénelon) makes good reading and added much to at least one reader's knowledge. But it is nothing more than a refinishing of an old and familiar landscape with some of the details made clearer, when what is wanted is an entirely new view.

The University of Chicago. LOUIS R. GOTTSCHALK.

The Armies of the First French Republic and the Rise of the Marshals of Napoleon I.; the Armées de la Moselle, du Rhin, de Sambre-et-Meuse, de Rhin-et-Moselle. By the late COLONEL RAMSAY WESTON PHIPPS, formerly of the Royal Artillery. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1929. Pp. xvi, 455. $7.50.)

A critique of the first volume of Colonel Phipps's invaluable work, which appeared in 1926 and treated of the Army of the North, was pub-

lished in this journal for October, 1928. The present volume is devoted to the other four armies, and the two volumes describe the schools in which the marshals and generals of the Napoleonic armies received their training. Colonel Phipps's postulate is that "The Consulate and the Empire cannot be judged until the Revolutionary period has been studied in detail" (*Armée du Nord*, p. 12) and that it is always profitable "to study bad as well as skilful campaigns and plans" (present volume, p. 212). For that reason, as well as for the fact that his narrative treats of the operations of each one of the five armies separately instead of combining those of two or more armies in the same theater of war, as most military writers heretofore have done and thus confused the reader hopelessly, his work is unique and invaluable for an understanding of the schools in which were educated the leaders and men who dazzled the world with their deeds from 1800 until 1815.

The character of the enemy is always an important factor in gauging the efficiency of an army, just as his opinion is of value in determining its worth. During the campaigns beginning with that of Valmy and terminating with Bonaparte's astonishing successes of 1796–1797 in Italy, the French were confronted by the Austrians and Prussians. The former were "slow and cautious in attack", and, as one author pertinently remarked, "it is against all principles of Austrian etiquette for a commander-in-chief to act or think for himself", except in the case of the Archduke Charles, whom Wellington considered "the greatest captain of the time". In 1796 the movements of the Austrian commanders "were so extraordinary that the Generals following in pursuit may be excused a good deal of astonishment and perplexity: indeed, we shall find even Bonaparte, who generally knew his Austrian like a book, keeping his horses and carriage at his door for twenty-four hours, unable to divine the real intent of the wandering columns of his enemy". The Prussians, on the other hand, were "ardent in assault and pursuit" and possessed "the best military cavalry in Europe" led by such officers as Blücher, so that the French learned much from them.

Between the enemy at the front and the devil in the rear, the lot of the French officers and men in the Revolutionary armies was anything but enviable. Absence of proper military organization—despite the "embrigadement" decreed on January 28, 1794, whereby a battalion of regular troops was amalgamated with the volunteers in each demi-brigade (*i.e.*, regiment)—persisted until 1796, while the lack of maps, pay, and supplies hampered all operations to a degree almost unbelievable. As late as 1796 the Army of the Moselle "was destitute of everything: it was hard enough for it to live, impossible to move, without trains" and the insubordination which pervaded all ranks was engendered by sheer famine.

The baleful interference of the civil authority with military affairs was continuous until the end of the Reign of Terror (July 27, 1794), and the presence with the armies of the *commissionnaires extraordinaires*—including for a short time "the formidable Saint-Just, who, handsome as

an angel, cold as ice, issued his sentences of death with the most perfect tranquillity"—completed the disorder already rampant. "Nobles were hunted from the army; the staff was 'purged'. Generals and officers were shot or degraded" until they tried to get themselves killed in battle or, as did Desaix and Saint-Cyr, refused promotion or important commands for fear that it would bring them to the guillotine. It should be added that this period of confusion and transformation produced certain remarkable features, such as the use of large bodies of skirmishers first employed in the French army by Custine who had served in America with Rochambeau (p. 30), the use of balloons for observation in battle (pp. 170–172), parachutes, and the telegraph by means of semaphores, invented by Chappe, which worked with such rapidity that the news of the capture of Le Quesnoy (August 15, 1794), was transmitted to Paris in one hour, and the reorganization by Hoche of the cavalry by the allotment of a regiment of chasseurs to each division of infantry and the formation of the rest into divisions by arms—a principle followed by Napoleon with slight modifications (p. 414).

Colonel Phipps's descriptions of the various commanders and those who attained great distinction during the wars of the Consulate and the Empire are unusually interesting. Among these are Kellermann, the victor of Valmy, Dumouriez, who contributed to the success at Valmy and later conquered Belgium, but was a "supple, daring intriguer", and Hoche, who became the commander of the Army of the Moselle at the age of twenty-five, "only seventeen months after the date of his first commission". "The history of the 'Sambre-et-Meuse' is bound up with that of Jourdan", who became a marshal under the Empire, but it has never been given the credit it deserves for its achievements. Its victory at Fleurus (June 26, 1794) "was not a brilliant feat of arms" but it pierced and finally drove back the invaders. Moreau, the commander of the Rhine-and-Moselle, has been given by historians "an importance that he never possessed" (p. 138). "Unequal to sudden emergencies, the real trial of a commander's skill", "hesitating, fumbling, short-sighted, bewildered even by success, selfish beyond the limits allowed to commanders, it is difficult to understand how such a man can be held up as a rival to the Master of War" (pp. 308, 401). Among others whose careers are also characterized are Davout, Lefebvre, Soult, Ney, and Mortier.

Colonel Phipps's work is thoroughly documented and is supplied with adequate skeleton maps. The two volumes constitute a notable contribution to military literature.

Geneva, Switzerland. FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER.

Briefwechsel der Königin Luise mit ihrem Gemahl Friedrich Wilhelm III., 1793–1810. Herausgegeben von KARL GRIEWANK. (Leipzig: K. F. Koehler. 1930. Pp. 368. 15 M.)

THE revived interest in Germany in the period of Prussia's collapse and regeneration during the period of French dominance is in itself of

some historical significance. The post-war books on the Stein-Hardenberg-Scharnhorst era are in contrast too with the sometimes chauvinistic tone of the books that appeared just previous to the World War in the centennial year 1913. There is in the present publications a more sober interest in the trials of the forefathers and an effort to understand how they won through their trials and kept their hopes alive in a period of national oppression and depression. Always central and yet apart from the tumult of war and politics is the figure of Queen Louise, sometimes treated with sentimentality and sometimes with a lyric exaltation that makes her in a sense what she is to Germans, their Joan of Arc, the one who breathes into the idea of a united and liberated Fatherland something of the exaltation that Joan gave to the mystic word *la patrie*. Whether either heard voices is not so important to history as that both are voices heard in different tones by succeeding generations of their countrymen.

In this collection of letters Queen Louise speaks for herself. Her letters and those of Frederick William were written almost wholly in French. Louise's mastery of that language was faulty and her original letters were phrased in a somewhat stilted and insecure idiom. The editor has faithfully translated these into German, no easy task, for her thought at times is very much of a puzzle. Dr. Griewank is eminently fitted for this task by his previous work on Queen Louise, and his introduction which is chiefly devoted to a character analysis of Frederick William III. and Louise is one of the features of the volume. His difficulty in dealing with Frederick William is that he is talking about a man whom birth made a ruler of men and to whom nature denied the essential qualities required by that exalted rank, especially in a period of stress and strain. Queen Louise and the period in which he reigned and the measures initiated by others give him all the glamour and interest that he has in history.

Louise was an excellent foil for the king's dry, pedantic, garrison commander, small estate mind and nature. Her letters show all her strength and all her weakness. She is a loving and tolerant wife who was always a girl bride in spirit, one who never quite grew up and died before she had to grow old. Suffering and sorrow sobered her but fortunately it never quenched her quick response to any opportunity to renew the joys of life she had known as a daughter of the Rhine Valley. In public affairs she played only the rôle that circumstances and the king's deficiencies forced upon her. But it was a significant one in fact and yet more important was the martyr's rôle assigned her by popular tradition. Blücher's wish that she might have survived to see the triumphant entry of Prussian troops into Napoleon's capital is perhaps the most significant definition of the part she played in the era of Prussian reform and regeneration.

The volume contains 236 letters exchanged between the royal pair. Some of them are published entire and others only in part. Dr. Griewank states that there are in the Brandenburg-Prussian House Archives 434

letters, 207 from the king and 227 from the queen. Many important ones have already been published, not always in German translation however. Some of the significant ones are not here included such as those of 1807 already published by Bailleu in the *Deutsche Rundschau,* CX. 1902. The fifty-three items in that important year here published are dated between April 10 and June 13, with one note of October 4 about Beyme's retirement from the cabinet on the eve of Stein's return. One has the impression that the publisher's wishes rather than the editor's, controlled in this and in other omissions.

Dr. Griewank has carefully indicated where additional published letters may be found as well as published French originals that he has translated. The illustrations include half tones of the least flattering portraits of Queen Louise, notably the drawing by Schadow used as a frontispiece.

The University of Minnesota. GUY STANTON FORD.

The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism. By ÉLIE HALÉVY. Translated by MARY MORRIS. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. xviii, 554. $8.50.)

PROFESSOR HALÉVY'S *Formation du Radicalisme Philosophique* was published in the years 1901–1903. The volume in hand is the English translation of that work. In the intervening quarter century M. Halévy has become known, through his *History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century,* as the leading French historian, and as one of the leading historians in any country, of British thought and politics since the late eighteenth century. The translation, compressing three volumes into one, omits two of the three appendixes and many of the footnote biographical sketches and quotations from Bentham's published and unpublished writings. Otherwise it is complete; and it is generally accurate and fluent—faithful to the extent of reproducing the few (and unimportant) factual mistakes of the original and occasionally rendering too literally the French idiom. The English volume contains an excellent twenty page bibliography of Bentham's works, preceded by a brief bibliography of the Utilitarians and Radicals generally, both by Mr. C. W. Everett.

M. Halévy sets forth at length and critically the origins, meaning, evolution, and influence of early nineteenth century British radicalism. Much of the account centers about the writings and activities of Jeremy Bentham. Part I. discusses the eighteenth century sources of the utilitarian doctrine and describes the ideas and efforts of Bentham in his conservative young manhood, from 1776 to 1789: his philosophy of law, his plans for penal reform, and his faith in a benevolent and paternalistic monarchy as the agency for reform. Part II. traces the extensions and transformations in Bentham's theoretical and practical interests during the years 1789 to 1815, showing how, under the influence of Tory indifference

to reform and of his association with James Mill, he became a "Radical"—taking the lead both in formulating doctrines and in devising specific proposals for political and economic change. Part III. considers the more immediate origins of radicalism—particularly in the principles of classical political economy, and supplies, more fully than in the earlier parts, the author's critical analysis of the whole meaning of the doctrine and its theoretical and practical implications.

The reader's main impression is one of admiration of a work so comprehensive, exact, and objective, which constantly reveals the author's keen and independent understanding of the special significance of the different ideas considered and of their logical interconnections. The only work that approaches it in completeness is Sir Leslie Stephen's *The English Utilitarians*, which appeared one year earlier than the publication of the first two volumes of M. Halévy's work.

The author's exposition shows generally that the Philosophical Radicals introduced no fundamentally new ideas. Their contribution has been of a different sort. They reduced current ideas to statements which were clear and precise, as abstract formulas, and which were also, in appearance at least, plausible and workable. In their advocacy of these formal principles, they employed an unusual combination of incisive theoretical expression, semipopular propaganda, and practical political activity. This, with their intense interest in beneficent legislation, had immediate practical consequences—in promoting free trade, the improvement and simplification of civil and criminal law and judicial procedure, the democratization of parliamentary representation, and other governmental changes removing injustices suffered by plain citizens. Moreover, their influence has persisted, so that their general methods and presuppositions are still widely accepted in the theory and practice of government. Orthodox ethical and political philosophy, it is true, has discarded many of their doctrines. It is generally agreed that their attempt to apply the specific methods of the natural sciences to moral and political behavior was a failure. Their "simple laws" were generally derived a priori, or were only superficially empirical—not based upon extensive observation and statistical record. Their criterion of greatest happiness for a greatest number of people is vague; pleasures can not be counted, measured, and compared in the exact manner that the utilitarian standard is held to imply; and the whole theory of utility offers, it is said, no reason why a government is under obligation to obtain or safeguard pleasure for any number of people. Nevertheless, we are probably more indebted to the Philosophical Radicals than we usually admit. M. Halévy's work greatly enlarges our understanding of the genesis and evolution of their "philosophy of emancipation".

Yale University. F. W. Coker.

The Struggle for Land in Ireland, 1800–1923. By JOHN E. POMFRET, Assistant Professor of History, Princeton University. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1930. Pp. xii, 334. $3.00.)

BENJAMIN DISRAELI, speaking in the House of Commons on February 16, 1844, summarized the Irish question of his day with penetrating acuteness. He described Ireland as a country with a teeming population, dependent solely upon agriculture, with absentee landlords, and an established church which was not the church of the people. He then said:

> If the connexion with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution was the only remedy, England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery in Ireland. What then, was the duty of an English Minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That was the Irish question in its integrity.

The ways by which the "English Minister" and Parliament, in the course of some sixty years, under the more or less stimulating persuasion of the Irish people, effected the changes of a revolution in that field in which Irish ills were most grievous, form the theme of Professor Pomfret's book on *The Struggle for Land in Ireland, 1800–1923.* It is not, strictly regarded, a history of the agrarian movement in Ireland, nor even of Irish land tenure, but rather of the statutory and administrative measures designed to ameliorate Irish grievances which had as their ultimate outcome the transformation of a land system of tenancy at will into one of ownership in freehold. The attendant social, economic, and political conditions in Ireland and Great Britain are set forth with a fullness sufficient—but not more than is sufficient—to make intelligible the central narrative. Distracting asides are thus avoided, and the author is able to make a straightforward, clear, and interesting presentation of his subject. The book has the further merits, not unique but certainly distinguishing, of scholarly honesty and absolute impartiality.

Exception will be taken, doubtless, to some of Professor Pomfret's statements, perhaps chiefly on topics connected with the setting of his theme. His present reviewer, and probably many of his readers, will not agree that "it is quite obvious . . . that nationalism in the modern sense of the word did not exist in Ireland until aroused by Davitt and Parnell in 1879" (p. 105). To them it will rather seem that what happened in 1879 and the following years was the forging of the weapons by means of which a people, deprived of the resources and the machinery by which a nation ordinarily gives expression to its will, was enabled to offer effective resistance to the foreign power that for preceding generations had controlled its destinies. Nor will the argument drawn from the career of O'Connell be convincing. The Repeal movement was not a failure in the sense that it did not receive the whole-hearted support of the Irish people. On the contrary, the history of the repeal agitation seems to testify to two things, the truly remarkable devotion to political nation-

alism of a precarious tenantry, standing near the verge of starvation, and the extraordinary personal ascendancy of O'Connell. That the Catholic emancipation movement succeeded while that for repeal of the Union collapsed, resulted from the facts that in the one case O'Connell was prepared to risk bloodshed and the British government was not, in the other the government was willing to take that risk, O'Connell was not.

An excellent bibliography and a useful, though incomplete, index are added. The book's format is a credit to the Princeton University Press.

Ottawa, Canada. JAMES F. KENNEY.

Lord Durham: a Biography of John George Lambton, first Earl of Durham. By CHESTER W. NEW, PH.D., Professor of History in McMaster University. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1929. Pp. xi, 612. $10.00.)

THIS book affords a good example of the wide latitude which biographers may allow themselves. For here is the life of Durham which ceases, halfway through, to be a biography in the ordinary sense, evolves rather into a study of the beginnings of responsible government in the British Empire, and yet remains one of the best political biographies of recent years. It will capture the interest of all intelligent readers, and the particular appreciation of those who have used Mr. Stuart Reid's *Life and Letters of the first Earl of Durham.* Mr. Reid, showing considerable enterprise in searching for material, and writing with the enthusiasm of one who was fulfilling a lifelong dream, produced a work which has been indispensable for the last quarter century. But to pass from the older to the newer account of Durham's life is to pass from a rambling narrative to a well-knit story finely, not to say dramatically, told, from enterprising to almost exhaustive search, from citation to documentation, from looseness to accuracy, from hero worship to detachment, from sympathy to psychology. An especially good example of all this may be found in a comparison of the two accounts of Durham's famous quarrel with Brougham. In the earlier, Brougham is a villain and Durham a paladin. In the later, one can almost feel that to understand all is to pardon all in the case of either man: and this because Mr. New has supplied the reader with a penetrating analysis of Brougham's career and character, a skillful reëxamination and reinterpretation of familiar documents, and a welcome supply of new evidence.

Selecting his materials with fine discrimination, and using fresh sources not only to reconstruct Durham's career, but to incorporate it effectively in the background of contemporary events, the writer has much to offer students of nineteenth century England for whom Durham's life may have no very particular significance. Those who would study the passing of the great Reform Bill, the British contributions to the establishment of Belgium as an independent state, and British relations with Russia in the 'thirties will find the book especially valuable. But Mr. New's scholarly achievements are displayed best of all when he treats of

the developments in Canada and England which hinged on Durham's Canadian mission. The appendix dealing with the authorship of the famous Report is an admirable demonstration of historical method on both the analytical and the constructive sides.

As usually happens, the reviewer's pencil will record a query or objection now and then. Is paucity of material, or withdrawal from active politics on Durham's part, responsible for the absence of any portrayal of his life during the chaotic but critical time that lay between the election of 1826 and the spring of 1830? The reviewer is also a little troubled by the author's tendency to overstate Durham's place in history. He will wish that Mr. New had found space to substantiate, for example, the conclusion that Grey individually initiated the lines of foreign policy pursued during the time he was prime minister.

Wesleyan University. HERBERT C. BELL.

British Colonial Policy in the Age of Peel and Russell. By W. P. MORRELL. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1930. Pp. xii, 554. $9.00.)

THIS volume is concerned with a very important twelve years (1841–1852) in the development of British imperial policy. In the previous decade, new ideas of treating the "white" colonies had been boldly put forward by "systematic colonizers", of whom Gibbon Wakefield is best known. Their ideas were permeated by the belief that, wherever possible, the society of the mother country should be reproduced in the colonies. But it was reserved to the decade treated by Mr. Morrell for these beliefs to have an appreciable effect on colonial policy. During the first half of this time Lord Stanley was colonial secretary under Peel, and for the remainder Earl Grey conducted the colonial office in the cabinet of Lord John Russell. The grant of responsible government to the North American and Australasian colonies came as the climax of an eventful decade.

The first third of the study treats of Stanley's time, and is really preliminary to a much fuller handling of the colonial policy of Lord John Russell's administration. It is a useful piece of investigation, performed in a very painstaking, even labored, fashion. The documentation is full, and shows the study to be based on a wide examination of unprinted material. The use made of the Earl Grey papers, hitherto unavailable, renders much more precise the judgment of his administration, even if the previous estimate of Grey is not greatly affected.

The author is somewhat inclined to be an apologist for the colonial office. The reformers are treated very critically. Stephen, the permanent undersecretary during this period—called Mr. Mothercountry by the derisive reformers—is termed "one of the most remarkable men of his generation", a man who had no more confidence in Wakefield the theorist than in Wakefield the man. The latter suffers even more severely

when he is compared with Earl Grey. To Mr. Morrell, the ardent Wakefield when writing on the *Art of Colonization* was impelled by "sheer jealousy and personal dislike" of the colonial secretary.

The latter part of the volume, indeed, tends to be a defense of Grey. In the matter of systematic colonization in Australia, for example, "There is not a little to be said in Lord Grey's defence" (p. 343). Even on the transportation matter it is pointed out that Lord Grey's policy was "unquestionably successful" in western Australia. Care is taken to affirm that Grey was not unmindful of the interests of the colonials, even if he left office in 1852 "unrepentant" on the transportation question. The concluding chapters compare and contrast the conflicting groups, when the breach between Grey and the reformers was complete. It is Morrell's judgment that the reformers tended too much toward liberty, and that Grey "was right in his general principle that the claims of freedom must be limited by the claims of unity" (p. 518), a euphemism that does not seem to possess much meaning in the light of later developments.

Each colony or problem has to be treated twice in view of the dual character of the study. This tends to confusion, especially when the thread of development can not be cut with propriety in the year 1846. Occasionally, too much detail is compacted into some of the chapters. This overelaboration is relieved by many well-turned judgments.

The bibliography is a list of the works used. The books cited might better be confined more carefully to the field of study. There seems little reason for including such works as Muir's *Short History of the British Commonwealth*, the *Dictionary of National Biography*, or Turner's *Frontier in American History*—and omitting, for example, Mills's *Colonial Constitutions* (1856) or Porritt's *Fiscal and Diplomatic Freedom of the British Oversea Dominions*. In a work of this character, a table of colonial appointments for the years under observation would serve as a useful aid.

Miami University. HOWARD ROBINSON.

Kaiser Friedrich III.: Tagebücher von 1848–1866. Mit einer Einleitung und Ergänzungen herausgegeben von HEINRICH OTTO MEISNER. (Leipzig: K. F. Koehler. 1929. Pp. li, 582. 15 M.)

FORTY-TWO years ago Geffcken caused the publication in the October number of the *Deutsche Rundschau* of extracts from the diary of the Emperor Frederick for the Franco-German War, 1870–1871. He was promptly arrested for high treason on the orders of Bismarck and William II. and specifically charged with the publication of state secrets as well as the falsification of documents. Then in 1899 Margaretha von Poschinger published a biography of the Emperor Frederick which contained extracts from his diaries for the years 1866, 1869, 1870–1871, and 1883. These extracts were however carefully edited and all political and higher military considerations were omitted. The present volume

contains all portions of the emperor's diaries from the outbreak of the March 1848 Revolution to the close of the campaign of 1866, and an appendix of twenty-nine documents. Herr Meisner has based his entire work on the sources in the Brandenburg-Prussian House Archives at Charlottenburg. An introduction by the editor and an index are of great value to the student of the diaries.

This volume throws new light on the activities of Frederick as Crown Prince of Prussia. It gives an excellent picture of his personality with its inner monarchical and liberal contradictions. Especially significant for a study of his character are the letters from Balmoral Castle during his courtship of the Princess Royal as well as his letters from England in December 1861. The political activities of Frederick in September 1862 and June 1863, not hitherto fully disclosed, are given in detail. The text of the petition of the council of state to King William I. urging him not to abdicate, is published here for the first time (p. 404). There are also many revelations concerning Bismarck's conflict with parliament. The graphic descriptions of these crises destroy the legend that the liberal prince was a supporter of the English system of government. Although Frederick was at first only an opponent of Bismarck's internal policy, he became violently opposed to his foreign policies as the Danish war progressed. On March 31, 1864, the good prince writes a paragraph of most vicious expressions concerning the pernicious chancellor.

The memorabilia of the campaign of 1866 commence with a description of the battle of Nachod, which Marshal Foch regarded as the classic battle of an advance guard. It was on this field that General Verdy exclaimed "To the devil with history and principles! After all what is my objective?" Of great interest are the notes on the decisive battle of Königgrätz which had been previously suppressed, because they show the limitations of Frederick's "aptitude for command".

The most important portion of the diary for 1866, which was omitted entirely by Margaretha von Poschinger, commences with July 23 and is concerned with Bismarck's struggle with his king over the terms of peace with Austria. It is to Frederick's credit, that as soon as he heard the distress cry of his great opponent whom he nevertheless believed to be right, he came to his aid. "Over these questions", Frederick wrote on July 24, "there were violent hours of debate during which I, in an incredible manner, supported Bismarck against the king's demands for territorial cessions on the part of Austria." And the next day he confided to his diary: "The king and Bismarck have clashed violently and this irritation has not yet subsided. Yesterday Bismarck cried in my presence over the hard things which His Majesty had said to him, so that I was forced to reassure him. . . ."

Stanford University. RALPH H. LUTZ.

La Vie et les Souvenirs du Général Castelnau, 1814–1890. Par GEORGES GIRARD. (Paris: Calmann-Lévy. 1930. Pp. 288. 15 fr.)

THE "Life" is here distinctly subordinated to the "Recollections", the author briefly sketching the general's career, leaving Castelnau to be his own spokesman as respects its major phases. Gaining his start under the July Monarchy, Castelnau easily and with general approval scaled the military ladder, and under Napoleon III. found his proper niche as the emperor's aide-de-camp. To his association with Napoleon he owes his place in history.

Organizer of the training camp at Châlons, he also participated in the Italian campaign of 1859. His reminiscences of the meeting of the emperors at Villafranca are interesting, as, indeed, are many of his personal sketches. He found Napoleon a pleasant man to serve, and has left agreeable vignettes of his domestic life, especially of "Loulou", the Prince Imperial, who was a favorite with the household officers.

So completely did he win the emperor's confidence that in the autumn of 1866 he was dispatched to Mexico with full authority to supervise the "repatriation" of French troops. Within his special field Castelnau, a mere general of brigade, thus outranked Bazaine, a marshal of France, in supreme command of the forces then in Mexico. The situation called for utmost tact, a quality which Castelnau abundantly possessed.

He avoided an open breach with Bazaine, although he considered the marshal's delays and reluctant obedience to orders as tantamount to treason. This he attributed to Bazaine's infatuation for a native wife, and his determination not to quit the country until he could sell his mansion at the capital. With Castelnau's reports before him, one rather marvels that Napoleon retained Bazaine in office.

In addition to the "treason" of Bazaine, the Mexican chapters present a life-size portrait of the vacillating, incompetent, and maladroit archduke, who found a scepter far beyond his capacity to wield. If Maximilian perished miserably, it was not for lack of warning or of opportunity to escape.

The interlude between Mexico and the War of 1870 is briefly summarized, and again the pen is left to Castelnau. In immediate attendance upon the emperor, he was present at Sedan and the surrender, and accompanied the captive to Wilhelmshöhe, where his picture of Napoleon as the guest of William I. is intimate and dignified. The emperor's reputation in no way suffers at his hands. There is a constant coming and going of paroled officers and Bonapartist princes, a constant succession of bad news from France, an almost equally constant effort on the part of Castelnau and others in his entourage to dissuade Napoleon from any controversy in the press as to the merits of Sedan. But there is no undue repining, no criticism of their German hosts. For a time Napoleon hoped that Bismarck would support the empire rather than permit a republic

on his western border. Bismarck admitted such a preference, but was not prepared to act on its behalf.

Had not the emperor resolved against even a miniature court, Castelnau would willingly have accompanied him to Chislehurst. But after their farewell at Ostend, he never met the emperor again. Two funerals completed his service to the dynasty, Napoleon's in 1873, that of the Prince Imperial in 1879.

Castelnau's final service to his country was the assistance which he rendered in reorganizing its system of military education.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

Documents Diplomatiques Français, 1871–1914. Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Commission de Publication des Documents relatifs aux Origines de la Guerre de 1914. Première série (1871–1900). Tome I., *10 Mai, 1871–30 Juin, 1875*; tome II., *1 Juillet, 1875–31 Décembre, 1879*. (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1929, 1930. Pp. xlvii, 496; xxix, 621. 60 fr. each.)

THE foreign policy of France, during the period covered by these first two volumes of the first series of the *Documents Diplomatiques Français*, was usually reserved and cautious. These qualities, it is true, were required by circumstances. Under Thiers, the recovery of France was inseparably associated with the loyal fulfillment of the terms of peace. He was always in advance of Germany's anticipations in regard to the payments of the indemnity, and if her consent made an early evacuation possible, it was sometimes secured only after an appeal from the decisions of the German bureaucracy and of Bismarck to the Emperor William (I., no. 31). In the main, the direction which Thiers gave to French policy was maintained by the monarchist ministries of Broglie and Decazes. The fear that the Near Eastern crisis might involve France in a general war became under Decazes, and it remained under Waddington, a compelling motive. The fear of complications remained for several years the *leitmotiv* of French diplomatic correspondence. French diplomacy stood for the unity of Europe on this question, it refused to participate in an armed demonstration in support of the decisions of the Constantinople conference, and Russia was urgently advised to keep the peace.

There were moments when a more active policy was considered. Even Thiers, although he also urged caution, instructed Le Flô to respond to any advances Russia might make and to be receptive to a suggestion of an alliance (I., no. 54). Broglie and Decazes advanced a step in this direction. In the hope of securing her coöperation, they represented Bismarck's irascibility, aroused by encouragement to the German Catholics in the pastoral letters of the French bishops, by the monarchist and clerical inclinations of the French government, and by the unexpected rapidity of French armaments, as an intent to precipitate war. It was not until the

spring of 1875 that Decazes succeeded in this enterprise, as well as in enlisting England. The documents relating to this episode, the famous "war-scare", will perhaps be read with more interest than any other section of these volumes. They are, on the whole, disappointing, for they add little to our knowledge of the crisis. It is to be regretted that the confidential letters exchanged between Decazes and Gontaut-Biron, parts of which appear in the writings of Broglie, Dreux, and Hanotaux, were not printed, for they are essential to an understanding of Decazes's policy. There is, of course, no support here for Bismarck's favorite theme of a plot between Gontaut-Biron and Gortchakov, but Decazes's real or feigned alarm as to Bismarck's intentions was based mainly upon indirect evidence. It is possible that a part of the difficulty was due to the complete absence of direct contact between the French ambassador and Bismarck at this time. There is no doubt as to Decazes's skillful use of his advantages, but his success in persuading Alexander, Gortchakov, and Derby to exert pressure in Berlin was made possible by their own alarm or by their own reasons for teaching Bismarck a lesson. Decazes attributed his success in part to the protest of the "public conscience" (I., no. 428), but these documents fail to show the means by which he helped to stimulate this movement of public opinion.

Decazes's policy was not without danger, and its result in creating a European union against Germany was short-lived as was soon evident in the Near Eastern crisis. Waddington's decision to participate in the Congress of Berlin after an assurance that no question involving French interests would be discussed was productive of more solid advantages to his country. His reports not only constitute a valuable source for the history of the congress, but also show that his part was more important than commonly supposed. Not without good cause did he conclude his last report: ". . . we have resumed . . . the place that is due France in the councils of Europe . . ." (II., no. 328). It is now clear that Salisbury's offer of Tunis, to reconcile France to the occupation of Cyprus, preceded Bismarck's advance, and that the latter's action was merely an approval (II., no. 330). It may be noted that Waddington thought at first, before Salisbury's change of heart delayed the application of his own plans in Tunis, of offering Tripoli as a satisfaction to Italy (II., no. 328).

Space does not permit more than a mention of a few interesting documents relating to the Alsace-Lorraine question in its bearing upon Franco-German relations, or to Saint-Vallier's approval of the increasing desire in Germany for colonies (in relation to the Samoan affair) as likely to lead to complications with the United States and England. In general, these volumes reveal the details of French policy and of current international relations in clearer light, and they confirm one's impression that French foreign policy during this troublous period, in spite of the numerous changes of ministries and of stormy political conditions, was usually wise and moderate.

Duke University. E. Malcolm Carroll.

Les Signes Avant-Coureurs de la Séparation: les Dernières Années de Léon XIII. et l'Avènement de Pie X., 1894–1910. Par le R. P. LECANUET. [L'Église de France sous la Troisième République, tome III.] (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1930. Pp. 616. 60 fr.)

ON such a subject as church and state, impartiality is inconceivable. Accuracy, consistency, clearness, we have a right to expect: not freedom from bias, when bias is the very criterion of thought. No Catholic historian can write otherwise than as a Catholic; and the most benevolent neutrality is interpreted by the Church as a denial of her absolute claims. Debidour's point of view, in his *L'Église Catholique et l'État en France sous la Troisième République*, was well enough defined: he was a secularist with a vengeance, a dyed-in-the-wool anticlerical. Father Lecanuet's position is not quite so clear. He sides unreservedly with the Church against the secular world; but he admits that there are radical differences among people who claim to be Catholics. He is himself a "liberal", in several of the innumerable meanings of that term. With Leo XIII. and therefore against Pius IX. he believes that the Church could and should be reconciled with modern democracy. He condemns the attitude of those ultras who vilified, with incredible violence, their moderate coreligionists, not excepting bishops, for following the instructions of Leo XIII. He deplores that, in the Dreyfus case, the bulk of Catholic opinion, the official Catholic press (*La Croix*), the Catholic leaders such as Albert de Mun, religious orders such as the Assumptionists, should have been ardently on the wrong side. But when the accumulated errors of the ultra-clericals are visited upon them, Father Lecanuet rallies to the defense of his Church, and considers every measure of the secular state as unwarranted persecution.

In spite of the author's honesty and talent, the book does not afford pleasant reading. In the first part—two hundred pages which might have been signed by Debidour—Father Lecanuet collects all the mean and scurrilous attacks of the Catholic extremists against the moderates; in the balance of the book, all the mean and scurrilous attacks of the anticlericals against the Church as a whole. These angry recriminations, we believe, do not tell the whole story. The life of the Church in France from 1896 to 1906 or 1910 was not purely a series of disgusting squabbles; and the leaders of the secularists from 1900 to 1906, including Jaurès, Anatole France, Francis de Pressensé, Ferdinand Buisson, were not invariably stupid and spiteful. Impartiality can not be attained; but acrimony could be avoided.

The title reads *L'Église de France*, the French Church, not *L'Église en France*. Although Father Lecanuet avoids bringing that point out, one feels throughout his work the last obscure efforts of Gallicanism to preserve a national Church, independent in its material administration, although in perfect spiritual communion with Rome. Gallicanism was doomed. The most active elements among the Catholics—the nobility, the religious orders—were committed to Ultramontanism. Perhaps the

clearest lesson of the whole book is that Napoleon was emphatically right when he called the Concordat his worst mistake. That hasty and equivocal compromise, full of traps and loopholes, did not give church and state even ten years of peace. It prepared a hundred years of dull, wearisome, dispiriting conflict. An honest and liberal separation policy was perfectly possible in 1801.

Stanford University. ALBERT GUÉRARD.

The First Moroccan Crisis, 1904–1906. By EUGENE N. ANDERSON, the University of Chicago. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1930. Pp. xi, 420. $4.50.)

THE scope of this volume is not indicated by its title. Morocco and the Powers furnish the central theme, but the shift in the European balance of power from 1898 to 1906 marks the wider limits of the work. Although lacking a bibliography, numerous references indicate an exhaustive examination of *Die Grosse Politik*, the *British Documents*, French *Livres Jaunes*, memoirs, reminiscences, periodicals, and other accessible printed materials. The first eight chapters deal with the origin of France's Moroccan policy; Franco-Italian and Franco-Spanish *rapprochements;* Anglo-German alliance negotiations; the 1904 accords between France, England, and Spain; Delcassé's policy towards Germany and the formulation of the program for 'pacific penetration' of Morocco. As Mr. Anderson is sketching the background of the later crisis, the threshing of some old straw is unavoidable. However, he sheds welcome light on the activity of the Comité de l'Afrique Française and Delcassé's efforts to solve the Moroccan question by direct negotiations with Spain in 1902–1903.

The international crisis that arose as a result of the new alignment of the powers and attempted monopolization of Morocco is the leading thread through the remaining nine chapters. The author treats in turn the German reaction to the Entente Cordiale and the policy of reserve during the summer of 1904; the attempt to counteract it by an alliance with Russia in the autumn of the same year; the return to direct action in the Moroccan question by the Kaiser's landing at Tangier; Delcassé's resignation and French acceptance of a conference; the Björkö Treaty and its annulment; Anglo-French military conversations; and the diplomacy of the Algeciras Conference.

Mr. Anderson's approach to his subject is indicated by the statement that because diplomacy was directed secretly by a few men, "By focusing attention upon these individuals, one can interpret the motives which consciously or unconsciously determined foreign policy. These men sublimated and represented the diplomatic mind of the nations." Precedent and practice among historians support this idea, but the reviewer ventures to suggest that works of this type would have less of an air of complete detachment from national life if in addition to France, England, and Germany, one considered also what Professor Madariaga calls "those

other Great Powers"—Banking, Shipping, Manufacturing, and the Press. The author does recognize the importance of public opinion, but conveniently assumes that "even it was given tangible shape in the minds of the responsible statesmen who had to interpret it and respond to its demands".

With Theodor Wolff, Count Monts, and Eckardstein, the author shares the opinion that Bülow's greatest mistake was the rejection of Rouvier's proposals for a general agreement with France. On the authority of Eckardstein and Caillaux he assumes that until July 8, Rouvier was willing to concede Germany a share in Morocco. "Germany could have placed herself on the same basis with reference to France that Great Britain occupied, both in regard to European and to colonial affairs." The difficulties in the way of such an agreement were fundamental: first, Rouvier's proposals were vague and indefinite; second, it is doubtful if England would have conceded Germany a foothold in Morocco; third, a general agreement would have involved a complete reversal of French policy since 1871, and Rouvier lacked the political support necessary to carry it out. This is only one of several instances where, on the basis of the same evidence, another investigator might honestly differ with Mr. Anderson's conclusions.

The author's citations indicate a wide acquaintance with recent books and articles falling within the range of his subject, but there is no reference to the work of Sidney B. Fay, to the admirable article by R. J. Sontag on German Foreign Policy, 1904–1906, in this journal (XXXIII. 278–301), or to the best article to date on Theodore Roosevelt und die Marokkokrisis von 1904–1906 (*Archiv für Politik und Geschichte*, 1928, Heft 2/3), by Adolph Hasenclever.

The University of Virginia. O. J. Hale.

Portrait of a Diplomatist: being the Life of Sir Arthur Nicolson, first Lord Carnock, and a Study of the Origins of the Great War. By Harold Nicolson. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1930. Pp. xvi, 337. $5.00.)

"An admirable example for the study of the old diplomacy at its best", says the author, of his subject. Certainly, few men of his generation were more deeply involved in that diplomacy than Sir Arthur Nicolson, few men better versed in its technique, better acquainted with its labyrinthine mazes. Few men touched it more closely at so many vital points: in Turkey, Egypt, Persia, the Balkans, Morocco, Spain, Russia. He it was who outmaneuvered Radowitz at Algeciras; who negotiated the Anglo-Russian convention; who was one of the chief architects of the Triple Entente; who encouraged Russia to resist Austria, and urged England to back France against Germany; who developed, if he did not originate, the "policy of encirclement"; who worked ceaselessly for definite commitments; who finally forced the hand of Grey, and who, with Churchill, Crowe and the rest, brought England into the war.

That is quite enough to stamp him as a diplomat of the old school; but not to condemn him, says his biographer. For what he did, he did from honest motives, and he played the game fairly. No one, not even his adversaries, ever charged him with trickery or duplicity. He sincerely feared the "German menace" and was haunted by the nightmare of "isolation". The Entente must be maintained; Russia must be prevented from slipping away; France was entitled to definite assurances; England had a right to know the danger; Germany might be deterred if she knew where England stood. "We had honestly no other object", says Sir Arthur, "than to place our relations on a safer and more secure basis in the general interests of peace" (p. 173). So said they all. They were all alike governed by their premises and were the victims of their fears.

No one knows that better than the author. No one has more clearly revealed the workings of the pre-war mind of Europe, or more accurately analyzed the psychological causes of the war. Nor has anyone with a surer hand or more dramatic skill traced the process by which acts of seemingly small significance gave rise to vague feelings, feelings grew to convictions, convictions hardened into policies, policies dominated the will, until Europe, which had professed, and probably sincerely, a desire for peace, found herself impelled to war. The story as Mr. Nicolson unfolds it has all the elements of tragedy, and for the reader, all the fascination of the fatal.

But never once does Mr. Nicolson allow his sense of the dramatic to deflect his scientific judgment. He writes as an historian, calmly, candidly, with an almost unbelievable detachment, free from trace or suspicion of filial partiality or patriotic bias. His life of his father is neither encomium nor apology; simply the story of one actor among many, told without exaggeration or false modesty. He selected him not as a hero, but because, as he says, "his character furnishes an excellent mirror in which the clouds and shadows of that epoch are reflected simply, clearly, and without distortion" (p. xii). In the same spirit he has drawn his portrait, simply, naturally, and without distortion. With equal frankness and honesty he depicts the rôle of his own country, attempting neither to exculpate nor justify, seeking only to explain. "Before we blame Germany", he says, "we must first blame our own Elizabethans . . . The Germans . . . were fired by exactly the same motives and energies which illumine what we still regard as one of the most noble passages in our early history. We, for our part, were protected against all imprudence by the repletion, passivity, and, I should add, the selfishness of old age" (p. xvi). Candor could go no further.

Brown University. THEODORE COLLIER.

Studies in Diplomatic History. By SIR JAMES HEADLAM-MORLEY, C.B.E., formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, late Historical Adviser to the Foreign Office. (New York: Alfred H. King. Pp. vii, 312. $3.50.)

THESE essays, all but one of which are memoranda prepared for the Foreign Office in the author's capacity as Historical Adviser, possess a special interest for historical scholars as practical applications of the principles and methods of their craft to the provision of a sound basis for the formation of current decisions of policy. The courses pursued by the British government in the past are analyzed "not only as an example to be followed; they are often a warning of what is to be avoided". There is no straining after the appearance of impartial objectivity; the undisguised object of each inquiry is to get at the bedrock of British interests in the problem and to show by what means they were best served. Not that these interests are viewed only in their narrowly selfish aspects. A spirit of endeavor to rise into a higher and purer political atmosphere than that of the past, to give due weight to the more enlightened conceptions of the present and future, pervades all the essays.

The light of past experience is thrown with most telling effect upon the devices which have been advocated as remedies for the evil of war: arbitration, reduction of armaments, security pacts, treaties of guarantee. While admitting the great usefulness of all these means of reducing international tensions, the author points out the limits which must be observed in their application, in order not to impair their benefits by putting too great a strain on their possibilities. The reader can not but regret that all the memoranda are of earlier dates than the Kellogg Pact. One would like to know Headlam-Morley's estimate of it in relation to such a pregnant statement as "the relative strength of armies and navies at any particular moment is always determined by the policy of the States; the settlement of political differences must therefore precede disarmament". The essay on treaties of guarantee suffers from overminute and not very convincing hairsplitting regarding definitions; while its argument regarding the guarantee to Belgium smacks of emotional appeal rather than legal or historical reasoning. Indeed, the author questions no part of the British official version of the war. It would be hard to make a statement more open to controversy than the following: "It was the German invasion of Belgium which, above all else, forced this country into the war; it was the German refusal to consider the complete surrender of the position they had secured there which made any peace negotiations impossible." This is somewhat dismaying as the judgment of the compiler of volume XI. of *British Documents on the Origins of the War*, containing the memoranda of Crowe and Nicolson, who must also have known the secret treaties defining the Allies' war aims. The essays on Egypt, Cyprus, and the Straits are almost purely narrative summaries, compact and informing, of the developments leading up to existing situations or, in the last case, the outbreak of the war.

Washington, D. C. J. V. FULLER.

Deutsche Rohstoffwirtschaft im Weltkrieg, einschliesslich des Hindenburg-Programms. Von Dr. OTTO GOEBEL, Professor für Volkswirtschaftslehre an der Technischen Hochschule, Hannover. [Economic and Social History of the World War, JAMES T. SHOTWELL, LL.D., General Editor.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1930. Pp. xv, 194. $2.50.)

Die Einkommensverschiebungen in Oesterreich während des Weltkrieges. Von Professor Dr. WILHELM WINKLER. [Economic and Social History of the World War, JAMES T. SHOTWELL, LL.D., General Editor.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1930. Pp. xv, 278. $2.50.)

THESE books might be bracketed together simply to show the wide scope of the Carnegie Peace Foundation's survey of the social and economic effects of the World War. But they also tie together for a deeper reason. Although during that struggle conditions in Germany differed in many respects from those in Austria-Hungary, and the control of raw materials in the former country bore but slight relation to the change of wealth and incomes in Austria, the two volumes present variations of the same theme—the progressive disintegration of national structure under the overstrain of modern military effort. Without designing to be so, both are impressive peace documents.

Professor Goebel tells with ample factual detail the story of blockaded Germany's efforts to provide herself with industrial raw materials. Incidentally he passes judgments upon men and measures that will engage the attention of both historians and economists. The latter may miss statistical tables and other quantitative data, or specific directions for finding these, but they will discover informing descriptions of the way prices act under regulation and their agility in evading official harnessing. The author gives a painstaking analysis of the administrative machinery set up to keep his country's factories and works in operation. He discusses the measures taken to keep wages, prices, and supply in step with each other, and the not always successful efforts to prevent profiteering. Incidentally he alludes, as have other authors of this series, to the difficulty of securing frictionless coöperation between military men and civilians in tasks where the former exercise final authority and the latter possess most of the expert training and special knowledge. Like some of his associates, he stresses Germany's unpreparedness for war—at least for such a war as she was called upon to wage.

Professor Winkler, one of Europe's most distinguished social statisticians, has shown exceeding skill in marshaling the relatively scanty data available so as to paint a fairly consistent and convincing, if not a complete, picture of the war's effect upon prices, wages, incomes, and public and private wealth in Austria. Naturally such tabulated statements can not be summarized in a short book notice. He shows that by 1918 real wages, prices, and national and private income had declined to

roughly one-half their 1913 level, and that despite some lag in particular industries and branches of industry the shrinkage was eventually so general as to be practically universal. Production followed a similar course. The instruments used—under duress—by the government thus to expropriate private wealth were price control and currency inflation. These facts are generally known, but they have not been analyzed so competently and presented with such statistical detail in any previous study known to the reviewer.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

La Guerra e le Classi Rurali Italiane. Per ARRIGO SERPIERI, Professore nel Reale Instituto Superiore Agrario e Forestale di Firenze. [Economic and Social History of the World War, JAMES T. SHOTWELL, LL.D., General Editor.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1930. Pp. xvi, 503. $6.00.)

THIS recent addition to the great Carnegie series maintains the high standard of the earlier volumes. The author is thoroughly familiar with the economic and social condition of the Italian farming population before and after the war; equally important, he knows the psychology of the rural classes. He is quite as much concerned with the spiritual and moral effects of the war as with its economic results. His profound understanding of the rural people and problems of central and northern Italy is remarkable; by comparison his treatment of the South and the islands suffers somewhat as it does from the absence of reliable statistics.

After an illuminating survey of the rural situation on the eve of the war, Serpieri turns to the attitude of the farming classes toward the war itself. It was the rural bourgeoisie, the proprietors of most of the Italian farm land, who joined with the small urban capitalists to place Italy by the side of the Allies; the mass of the rural population, aloof from both national and international politics and strongly influenced by the neutral Church, or, in the case of the farm wageworkers, by socialistic thought, opposed intervention. Here is the partial explanation of the outburst on the Italian countryside of that bitter class warfare which characterized the turbulent post-war period. True, the rural bourgeoisie suffered most from the war and its aftermath, for government arbitrarily kept down prices of foodstuffs and of rents; some at least of the rural workers, particularly the money renters, gained financially. Already before the close of hostilities *la terra ai contadini* had become the watchword of the farmers. The more prosperous were able to buy their small holdings from the harassed landlords, greatly increasing the number of Italian peasant proprietors; the others sought to better their condition by united action against the proprietors. Here they found powerful agencies in the Red and White leagues. The first, under Socialist control, fought violently to advance the interests particularly of the rural wageworkers; the second, under Catholic inspiration, worked to acquire

for the share tenants more generous treatment and greater freedom in the management of their holdings. In the South the movement, with governmental support or assent, led to the partial breaking up of the latifundia but without solving the complex rural problems of the Southland.

It is a striking picture which Serpieri draws of semi-anarchical conditions in the early post-war years, of governmental weakness and incompetence in handling the rural situation. Here was the soil from which Fascismo grew. (It is needless to add that the author is a Fascist; was not the book published in Italy?) Here is the material for the classic apology of the Fascist régime in its initial stages, material nowhere else set forth with such a wealth of illustration. It was the break-up of the Red and White leagues, partly under the shock of Fascist blows, that set free the rural population to coalesce again in the serried ranks of the new régime.

The complex subject did not conduce to brilliance and the author's style, somewhat heavy and involved, has hardly overcome the difficulty of his material. Nevertheless this is an able study of great value.

The University of Vermont. PAUL D. EVANS.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Dictionary of American Biography. Edited by ALLEN JOHNSON and DUMAS MALONE. Volume IV., Chanfrau-Cushing; volume V., Cushman-Eberle. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. Pp. ix, 637; ix, 616. $250 for the complete set.)

NEW installments of the *Dictionary of American Biography* continue to issue from the press with almost clocklike regularity. With the publication of the fourth and fifth volumes a quarter of the great enterprise is completed, a total of 3447 memoirs has been presented, and a beginning made on the fifth letter of the alphabet. An important change in the editorial staff appears in the appointment of Dr. Dumas Malone, formerly research professor of history at the University of Virginia, as managing editor in association with Dr. Johnson. The new volumes contain 723 and 691 biographies respectively, that is, if Chang and Eng, the Siamese Twins, are considered as one person, and if we may count in the same way the precocious Davidson sisters (Lucretia M. and Margaret M.), who are treated in a single memoir, perhaps because they died at a very tender age. The Brown and Brownes of volume III. retain the palm for frequency of mention, but both the Davises, with 45 entries, and the Clarks and Clarkes, with 53, outnumber the Adamses of volume I. Other surnames holding high numerical rank in the present volumes are: Cook and Cooke, 26 notices; Cooper, 20; Cox and Coxe, 18; and Dwight, 15.

The efforts of both editors and contributors maintain the same high level of workmanship that readers have become accustomed to expect. The chief contrast with the first three volumes appears in the greatly reduced number of contributors. Volume IV. was the product of 144

different pens, volume V. of only 131, while the number of contributors to each of the earlier volumes averaged 299. If these figures are significant, they indicate a departure from the original plan of seeking contributions from a wide range of historical and literary scholars and the adoption of a policy, akin to that of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, of relying chiefly on assignments worked up by a corps of trained, general-utility investigators. As must be expected in a collaborative work, not all the sketches are of equal merit. Some articles, like that on Joseph Hodges Choate, are more concerned with praise than appraisal; others, like that on Caleb Cushing, seem padded; while still others, like that on John Singleton Copley, are merely factual when critical evaluation is also of essential importance. Despite such unevennesses the articles, generally speaking, are critical, sympathetic, clear-cut, compact, and well rounded. The undeviating fair-mindedness with which the contributors have treated the most bewildering variety of human beings ever brought together between sober maroon bindings is a lasting testimonial to the objectivity of American scholarship.

It is somewhat unfair to single out memoirs for special mention since the reader's attention is naturally attracted by characters of outstanding importance while greater skill of research and interpretation may be entailed in the preparation of notices of minor or obscure persons. If allowance is made for this, however, the more notable biographies may be said to include J. G. Randall's "Salmon Portland Chase", C. M. Fuess's "Rufus Choate", J. A. James's "George Rogers Clark", Louise P. Kellogg's "William Clark", Carl Van Doren's "Samuel Langhorne Clemens" and "James Fenimore Cooper", Dixon Ryan Fox's "DeWitt Clinton", R. P. Brooks's "Howell Cobb", H. C. Hockett's "Samuel Sullivan Cox", John Dickinson's "Benjamin Robbins Curtis", W. P. Eaton's "Charlotte Saunders Cushman", Allan Nevins's "Charles Anderson Dana", W. E. Dodd's "Henry Winter Davis", N. W. Stephenson's "Jefferson Davis", W. J. Ghent's "Eugene Victor Debs", R. E. Cushman's "James Brooks Dill", Allen Johnson's "Stephen Arnold Douglas" (in which he reconciles the antagonistic views of Hodder and Ray in regard to the Kansas-Nebraska Act), Christina H. Baker's "Dorothea Lynde Dix", J. D. Hicks's "Ignatius Donnelly", Ellwood Hendrick's "John William Draper", and the essays by W. H. Downes on "Asher Brown Durand", "Frank Duveneck", and "Thomas Eakins".

A perusal of the volumes under review confirms the feeling that biographers and historians might more fruitfully devote their energies to full-length critical lives of men and women of secondary rank rather than thresh over again the familiar data concerning major historical figures. Every installment of the *Dictionary* has revealed opportunities of this sort; from the present volumes may be cited such names as John Covode, Edgar Cowan, James H. Cowper, George B. Cox, Jacob D. Cox, John J. Crittenden, Henry L. Dawes, Jonathan P. Dolliver, and Ignatius Donnelly. One is especially struck by the opportunities offered in the field

of Southern biography, thanks to the many sketches of minor characters contributed by Broadus Mitchell, John D. Wade, R. P. Brooks, and others.

The democratic criteria applied by the editors to the selection of names for inclusion inevitably raises the question why other persons equally or more important were omitted from the *Dictionary*. In particular the question seems pertinent in regard to the following: Frederick A. Chapman (1818–1891), painter and stained-glass decorator; Ellis S. Chesbrough (1813–1886), sanitary engineer; Robert Child (1613–1654), physician, scientist, and famous "Remonstrant" of Massachusetts Bay Colony; Lucius E. Chittenden (1824–1900), lawyer and historian; Samuel P. Choppin (1828–1880), specialist in plastic surgery and ovariotomy; Samuel W. Chubbuck (1800–1875), inventor and manufacturer of telegraph apparatus; Jonathan Cilley (1802–1838), victim of one of the most famous duels in American history; Mary Bucklin Claflin (1825–1896), author and humanitarian; Meriwether L. Clark (1846–1899), sportsman and author of most of our present day turf rules; Patrick Clark (1818–1887), inventor of important improvements for the steam boiler, etc.; Annie Clarke (1845–1902), one of the best known stock actresses of her time; Thomas C. Clarke (1827–1901), international bridge engineer; Benjamin Coates (1808–1887), abolitionist and humanitarian; Charles F. Coghlan (1841–1899), actor and playwright; Jennie Collins (1828–1887), philanthropist; Katharine Coman (1857–1915), economic historian; Edward S. Cooper (1821–1862), surgeon and educator; Florence E. Cory (d. 1902), textile designer; Richard K. Crallé (d. 1864), editor of Calhoun's works; Kate Davis (1863-1901), actress; Edwin De Leon (1828–1891), diplomatic agent and engineer; George Derby (1819–1874), sanitarian; John Wood Dodge (1806–1893), portraitist; Harvey B. Dodworth (1822–1891), musician and bandmaster; Thomas C. Donaldson (1843–1898), private collector and author of *The Public Domain*; Sir James Douglas (1803–1877), Hudson's Bay Company chief factor and successor to Dr. John McLoughlin at Fort Vancouver; John M. Dow (1827–1892), naturalist; and George Duffield (1816–1888), hymnologist.

Misstatements of fact are neither frequent nor, in most cases, serious. Three quotations from W. E. Channing (IV. 6–7) contain minor inaccuracies. Francis J. Child was survived by three daughters and one son, not by four daughters (IV. 66). The Whig party had not yet come into existence in 1828 (IV. 185), and on the same page a wrong impression is given of the real point at issue in the Ohio-Michigan boundary dispute. Moses Cleaveland's name is inconsistently spelled on pages 188 and 205. The statement that the Democratic national convention of 1888 failed to endorse the Mills Bill (IV. 209) is untrue, for it did so by the unanimous adoption of a special resolution. Greeley received the Liberal Republican, not the "Liberal", nomination (IV. 443). A single short sentence does insufficient justice to Thomas Corwin's services as minister to Mexico "during the critical years 1861–64" (IV. 458).

Lemuel Cox's structure in 1786 was not "the first bridge across the Charles River" (IV. 479) by more than a century. The statement that Jane Cunningham Croly was "probably the first American newspaper woman" (IV. 560) overlooks Amelia Bloomer's activities (II. 385) and Cornelia W. Walter's editorship of the Boston *Transcript* from 1842 to 1847 as well as the better known services of various women newspaper proprietors in colonial times. There was no "Fillmore ticket" in the presidential election of 1852 (IV. 588). The account of Manasseh Cutler's land dealings (V. 13) omits to mention the contract he signed with the Treasury Board for an option on three and a half million acres of Ohio land. The analysis of the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 is inexact and misleading (V. 149–150). The memoir of William Rufus Day (V. 163–165) omits his significant dissenting opinion in Wilson *vs.* New (243 U.S., 332), which first clearly marked his change from a liberal attitude toward social legislation to a conservative position. Nor do legal scholars esteem Day's literary style as "elegant" and "concise" (V. 165), though it possesses other merits. That Lorenzo Dow was the "inventor of camp-meetings" (V. 410) is highly dubious, and is not claimed for him by the special sketch of Dow in the *Dictionary*. As for typographical errors the expression "had showed" (IV. 442) may perhaps be so regarded, but the most startling one noted is the allegation that the *comédienne* Louisa Lane Drew was a "cosmic actress" (V. 455).

Harvard University. A. M. Schlesinger.

Builders of the Bay Colony. By Samuel Eliot Morison. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1930. Pp. xiv, 365. $5.00.)

Included in this gallery of notable historical portraits for the tercentenary year are "those characters of the first generation who", says the author, "appealed to me most, and who represent the various aspects of life" in the first half century of Massachusetts history. They are the chosen spirits, certainly, of that time and place, which may explain why they look down upon us with somewhat unexpected benignity. There are miniatures of the "promoters and precursors", Hakluyt, Captain John Smith, Morton of Merrymount; then on a larger scale Master John White of Dorchester, the two John Winthrops (but not Endecott nor Thomas Dudley); Thomas Shepard, best loved of the clergy, John Hull, Henry Dunster, Nathaniel Ward, Robert Child, John Eliot, Anne Bradstreet. Here is New England Puritanism on its highest level.

Morison's book in fact is written in a tone of spirited rebuttal against the views of early Massachusetts which have been most ably developed by James Truslow Adams. "It is always easier", he reminds us, "to condemn an alien way of life than to understand it." The builders of the Bay colony, he insists, were "moved by purposes utterly foreign to the present America", and must be judged historically in the light of their age and of their intent. He has no difficulty in showing that many of the current implications of the term Puritanism were absurdly remote

from seventeenth century standards. He does well, certainly, to restore the true center of gravity to religion. And he scores heavily against a central point in the revisionists' case. "Were the settlers of Massachusetts Bay Puritans?" he asks in a witty appendix. This question he answers with an emphatic affirmative, upsetting the purported statistical basis for assuming that "four out of five" of the rank and file were out of sympathy with Puritanism. But to some it will appear that he has pressed his refutation too far: that he has not allowed sufficient weight to such supporting incentives to the Puritan migration as social disorders and economic difficulties at home, especially in East Anglia.

The author has nowhere disguised his "warm interest and respect" for his characters. Even though in most of these studies he has not gone far beyond the familiar sources, he has been able to make these men live again. Where will one find a more sympathetic—or accurate—account of the place of the clergy in that peculiar society than in his "Master Thomas Shepard"? Harvard under Dunster comes to life, and appears not unworthy of the recognition bestowed upon it thus early by the elder English universities. (At last we have a plausible explanation of the order of listing its graduates.) At the same time the tone is perhaps excessively defensive—"we must not cavil at the ways of saints". The case for the intolerance of the theocracy has never been more effectively put, but one wonders if Professor Morison himself is entirely convinced? Occasionally he reveals misgivings. Its immediate necessity he confines to a short period; its ultimate justification he discovers only after the lapse of two centuries with the late flowering of the well-pruned tree of Puritanism in the generation of Channing, Emerson, Hawthorne, and Thoreau! It is well enough to explain some of the less agreeable features of the Puritan régime as "the way things were done in the seventeenth century", but this formula may be used also to explain several items on the credit side, such as that craftsmanship in houses and silver for which the author reveals the fine appreciation of the connoisseur. Was not this also generically English of that time? True, Puritanism is thus shown not utterly hostile to æsthetics. Professor Morison warmly champions the poetic genius of Anne Bradstreet against condescending literary historians, who, he surmises, have read only her worst verse. But Moses Coit Tyler, for one, wrote of her with balance and no little sympathy, and quoted freely from several of the poems here cited as her best.

There is much admirable writing in these essays to sustain the author's brilliant literary reputation, but also a good deal of current slang which rings out of tune in that finished style. One must look sharply to detect even minor errors of scholarship. Only one need be recorded, and that because it has appeared elsewhere. Hakluyt's *Discourse on Western Planting* was not a promotion tract addressed to the English people, as is implied (p. 5), but a memorial to the queen which was not printed until the nineteenth century and apparently was read by few contemporaries in manuscript.

The University of Michigan. V. W. Crane.

Documents Illustrative of the History of the Slave Trade to America. Edited by ELIZABETH DONNAN, Professor of Economics and Sociology in Wellesley College. Volume I., *1441–1700.* [Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication no. 409.] (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1930. Pp. x, 495. $3.50.)

THIS volume comports with the high standards with which we have long been familiar in the documentary publications of the Carnegie Institution under Dr. Jameson's guidance. The provenience and elucidations are admirable, and the introductions, to the records of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries respectively, are well considered. A second volume will extend the general collection to 1807 when the British and American governments prohibited slave importations, and a third will shift the emphasis "from the history of the trade to the connection of the Thirteen Colonies with that trade" (preface).

This particularization announced for the third volume is an implicit acknowledgment that categories are called for; and I think some compartmenting would have been expedient in volume I. which treats, among other things, "the beginnings of African exploitation, the friction of European countries in Africa, the development of great commercial companies for the control of the traffic, the struggle for Spanish-American markets, the methods of trade, and its effect on English policy in the West Indies". The chronological order in which the diverse documents are presented gives one who peruses the successive pages a sense of watching a kaleidoscope. It may be said in defense that this is an assemblage, not a treatise. The fact remains that few concur with the legendary lady who found the dictionary charming because it so often changed the subject. An elaborate index merely mitigates the effect of scattering contemporary general analyses throughout the thick volume, and of interrupting the vivid threads of the Royal African Company's business with a sprinkling of irrelevant (and partly immaterial) items from the Spanish archives.

Another problem which evidently confronted the editor was that of selection, and in particular whether to reprint what is accessible in the larger libraries. The decision was affirmative, so the reader finds familiar passages from Azurara, Merolla, Bosman, and other old friends. One wonders as to the next volume how much room will be left for other things after the pages of Snelgrave and Francis Moore have been requisitioned for all the good matter which they contain. The answer is doubtless that automatically an increase in bulk and interest of archival and informal material with each passing decade must compress more and more the space afforded to selections from authors of old repute.

The volume gives little of the slaves' point of view; but that is the lament, certainly not the fault, of the editor. One slaving captain said in 1693, disapproving the callousness of his fellows toward the negroes: "I can't think there is any intrinsick value in one colour more than an-

other, nor that white is better than black, only we think so because we are so, and are prone to judge favourably in our own case, as well as the blacks, who in odium of the colour, say the devil is white, and so paint him" (p. 403). But even this enlightened sailor had nothing to say concerning the personal or tribal traits of the men and women in his custody. Ignorant of their languages, and they of his, he had little occasion or opportunity for appraisal. It was the planters, who had to live and work with the blacks, who differentiated Coromantee from Foulah and Eho from Congo. If ship captains and supercargoes concerned themselves at all in such matters it was merely to reflect the preferences of the colonial markets. In this volume the planters, in a sense, have no hearing.

Nevertheless the collection as it stands is rich and freshly informing. To me it was not known, for example, that for some years each Royal African ship was expected to take on a parcel of Gold Coast slaves and use them as police over a cargo to be procured at Whydah (pp. 361, 407), or that as early as 1700 the Congo slave trade ramified as far as two hundred leagues into the interior (p. 458). In short, while giving little ground for changing the general view of the trade as presented by latter-day students, and yielding not enough data to invite a revision of statistical estimates or conjectures, it permits an enlargement of knowledge in a hundred details of a complicated, unsavory business.

Yale University. ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

Johnson of the Mohawks: a Biography of Sir William Johnson, Irish Immigrant, Mohawk War Chief, American Soldier, Empire Builder. By ARTHUR POUND, in collaboration with RICHARD E. DAY, LITT.D. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xvii, 556. $5.00.)

Lords of the Valley: Sir William Johnson and his Mohawk Brothers. By FLORA WARREN SEYMOUR. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1930. Pp. 278. $3.00.)

THE author of the first of these books attempts a portrayal of the life and character of Sir William Johnson, the central figure in all transactions relating to the northern and western Indians during that significant international conflict which resulted in the English conquest of New France. In the main, the ground covered extends from 1738, the year of Johnson's arrival in New York, to the year of his death in 1774. The recent publication of *The Sir William Johnson Papers* now makes more readily accessible the sources for the area and period of Johnson's activities, which will enable scholars henceforth to present in a truer light the conflict which raged in the northern and western woods. The chief reliance of the author of the present work is upon that indispensable source. That the best possible use has been made of the material in the present instance may be questioned. Nevertheless Mr. Pound has attained what the reviewer considers a fair appraisal of the monumental

achievements, and failures, of Johnson. It is an excellent antidote to the prejudices which Parkman so firmly fixed in the minds of readers of his attractive pages. Whenever the impact of whites and Indians was concerned, Parkman succeeded mightily in placing the latter, together with their great protector, in an unfavorable light.

Johnson's early career in America, as a protégé of his uncle, Admiral Peter Warren, is carefully analyzed. There was much tradition to cut away, and Mr. Pound has succeeded in presenting an accurate picture of the young pioneer's activities on the Mohawk, as farmer and trader. The early contacts of the young Irishman with the neighboring Mohawks soon resulted in the establishment of a reputation among the Indians as a neighbor and trader whose word could be relied upon. From this point Johnson rose rapidly to a commanding position in the province of New York, and ultimately to the office of sole Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the northern district.

Students of the period have come to recognize that Johnson's influence on the destinies of the English speaking peoples in North America, in the middle of the eighteenth century, was greater than that of any other person. Mr. Pound does not produce new evidence of this fact, but through the avenue of approach which he furnishes, we are enabled to see it more clearly. The chief theme of the book is the contribution of Sir William in keeping open the one line of communication with the great West, which lay along the valleys of the Hudson and the Mohawk, and by way of the Great Lakes. This route was an exposed one, and it could be preserved, and the way to the West kept open, only by maintaining friendly relations with the Six Nations. The responsibility for the Indian negotiations leading to this end was Johnson's. And after the cession of New France and the West to England in 1763 there began the great westward movement of the whites, which precipitated a problem scarcely less difficult, in preventing the encroachment of the settlers upon Indian lands. Such an invasion meant the destruction of the fur trade and the hostility of the natives. Upon Johnson again fell the difficult task of reconciling the various conflicting interests.

The author's practice of relegating footnotes to the appendix can not be too severely condemned. Among the notes one finds no reference to Wood's scholarly life of *William Shirley*, or McIlwain's edition of Wraxall's *Abridgment of the Indian Affairs . . . in the Colony of New York*, both of which are indispensable. He dilates at length upon the struggle between Johnson and General Shirley, but makes no mention of the bitter controversy between the former and Governor Carleton of Canada. One also misses a clear analysis of the details of Indian administration, particularly on the financial side, with which Johnson was greatly concerned.

Miss Seymour's *Lords of the Valley* is another, but much briefer popular account of Johnson. It is based upon the same sources of information as the foregoing work of Pound's. It is a chatty, romantic

account, with little or no emphasis upon the great significance of Johnson's management of Indian affairs as an imperial task. The writer passes lightly over some phases of the subject which Pound elaborates, such as Sir William's ancestry and his domestic lapses. There are no citations to sources, even though one finds throughout the book extensive quotations from the sources. This makes the work of less value for scholarly use. But it was evidently the intention to produce only a popularly written narrative. There is appended a short bibliographical note, in which one misses both *William Shirley*, a biography by Wood, and *Correspondence of William Shirley*, edited by Lincoln. The latter is especially valuable in understanding the controversy between Shirley and Johnson. On page 276 Dickinson should be Dickerson. An index is lacking.

Miami University. C. E. CARTER.

The Adams Family. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1930. Pp. vi, 364. $4.00.)

THE plan and intention of Dr. Adams's book are unusual; indeed it may well be that it shall long remain unique in its class, for hardly could another American family be found to which his mode of treatment would be appropriate in anything like the same degree. American democracy is unfavorable to hereditary political influence. Family migration, more frequent than in any other country, makes such inheritance far less likely than in old-settled lands like England,

> Where Aylmer followed Aylmer at the hall,
> And Averill Averill at the rectory.

No such family successions of political eminence as have occurred in the aristocracies of England and Rome are to be expected in our history; and no American family conspicuous in public life has ever shown such a combination of extraordinary character and extraordinary intelligence and gift of expression as has been manifested for at least four generations in the family founded by John Adams. Of this family (to which, he tells us, he is nowise related) Mr. Adams has undertaken to write a biography—not such a history as could easily be made of many a family by composing a succession of biographies of individual members, but a narrative unified by constant reference to those permanent traits held in common by the Adamses from generation to generation, to a degree quite unusual among us.

What have been these common characteristics? Anyone can see the differences between the explosive John and his grandson the calm, cool, judicious Charles Francis the elder, or, even in the same generation, that just vanished, between the sturdy Charles Francis II., man of affairs, the reflective literary Henry, and the gloomy-minded Brooks. But all Adamses seem to have had in superlative degree that quality rarest among American public men, independence of character and of thought. All have

been highly conscientious, honorable, public-spirited, incapable of twisting public service into a means for private advancement. All have had the mental habit of looking instinctively at the larger aspects of public life and human history. All have had unusual gifts of expression, a strong impulse toward the pen, and that self-consciousness that leads to the writing of diaries and autobiographies. All, however familiar with Europe and its culture, have been good Americans, in the sense of being ardent in defense of their country's rights and interests, and well content to share its life rather than that of the older lands.

Dr. Adams has achieved his purpose with distinguished success, both as to the permanent elements held in common by the successive generations and as to the individual lives. His book well deserves its Pulitzer Prize and the popularity which—if for once we can believe publishers' advertisements—it has already obtained. Written with great literary skill, it is evidently destined, along with higher successes, "to supersede the last fashionable novel on the tables of young ladies" (Macaulay's hope), and to carry a knowledge of much American history into quarters where only "best sellers" can carry it. No doubt many of its readers are already familiar with the last generation of Adamses through Henry's *Education*, and some of them through the manly autobiography of his brother Charles; but it will be a great and needed service to draw renewed public attention to the neglected merits of those two great statesmen, John and John Quincy, of whose lives and characters Mr. Adams gives a truly admirable account. It is a pleasure to see also that he duly appreciates the heroic Abigail, a woman who would have been illustrious in the annals of any house, and whose bright and discerning pen illuminates many years of American history.

Neither John Adams nor his son John Quincy is now a popular character. Among the countless statues in our cities hardly one commemorates either of them. Neither of them obtained the reward of reëlection, though half the Presidents who have won it have been inferior to them in quality and in deserts. Who was the greatest constructive statesman of the Revolution if it was not John Adams? Who ever entered upon the Presidency better fitted for its duties than his son, or with a higher or more intelligent conception of its opportunities? Of neither of these Presidents is there an adequate biography, or an adequate publication of their excellent letters, and Dr. Adams's book will be the chief guide of most readers toward appreciation of the two.

Dr. Adams duly emphasizes the tragic aspect of his story. John Adams's robust independence, his determination to follow firmly what he thought to be right and for the best interests of his country, succeeded on the whole well in his time. The same traits in his accomplished and high-minded son succeeded till he became President. By that time the tide was running differently. "The forces which had moved John Adams in 1776 had coincided with the major social forces of that time. Growing industrialism, the expansion of the West, a constantly widening electorate, the rise of democracy, had all powerfully deflected the social forces of

John Quincy's time. It was clear that the forces which moved Adams and the forces which moved society, so far from coinciding, were rapidly diverging, and that Adams, moving straight along the family line, was already far from the social and political opinions which spelled power in 1825 and were more and more to do so." From the time when the people became passionately resolved to entrust supreme power to a mind like Andrew Jackson's, the divergence was indeed to proceed further and further. Times changed; they could not change the Adamses.

Victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni,

and the chief public service of Charles Francis the elder, vital to the republic, and all those of Charles Francis II., notable services in several lines, all had to be performed in positions not elective.

But whatever grave reflections Mr. Adams's narrative may excite, he has produced a book which every intelligent young man may profitably read for the splendid examples it presents of manly independence, enlightened patriotism, and unselfish devotion to the public service; and older persons may read it with pride that our history has contained lives so rich in the fruits of intelligence and public spirit.

The Library of Congress. J. F. Jameson.

George Washington. By Rupert Hughes. Volume III., *The Savior of the States, 1777–1781.* (New York: William Morrow and Company. 1930. Pp. x, 820. $5.00.)

In his first volume, Mr. Hughes carried his life of Washington from 1732 to 1762. His second volume concludes with the Battle of Trenton at the end of 1776. In the present volume he carries his narrative from the Princeton campaign to the final scene of the war in the siege and surrender of Yorktown. Presumably this volume will be followed by at least one more, giving the life of Washington through his administration as President and to his death at Mount Vernon.

In explanation of the monumental dimensions of his work, the author writes in his Afterword:

> This biography began blithely as a one-volume study of certain neglected phases of Washington's career and character. It seems doomed to go on forever and forever, piling up tomes of increasing bulk and diminishing scope.
>
> The fault is really Washington's for living so vast and various a life of such unrivalled significance in so many fields. Further blame is due to those who keep turning up important documents and revising earlier attitudes. . . .
>
> I am not, alas, one of those strong characters who are able to say NO to thousands of picturesque or significant deeds and utterances of the hero, and deny them publication. I look with envy on authors who are gifted with the power to write more or less brilliant one-volume biographies of enormous men, and I falter in awe before those who can serenely put forth what are fashionably called evaluations. . . . An evaluation of

Washington, or even a brief account of his life is like a transcontinental railroad map. It shows nothing of the scenery, emphasizes one route in straight black lines, represents connecting roads by their threads and deletes the others altogether. It distorts every thing that it indicates and omits infinitely more than it includes.

It is perhaps the highest tribute to this work, that the author has avoided the method he thus describes so concisely. As the narrative progresses from day to day, Washington is presented in his actual environment as he described it in his own language and as it was described in the language of his contemporaries. The surrounding scenery is presented as the author has restored it from a great variety of sources in his most diligent researches. The result is that Washington is revealed to us in his difficult environment as it developed from day to day. Instead of "evaluating" his hero himself, the author presents him with his surrounding difficulties for the reader to appraise. The result is a new and ever-growing demonstration of Washington's greatness.

Notwithstanding the great mass of evidence cited in this book the author has not permitted his notes to break the flow of an interesting story told in highly readable manner. This he has accomplished by placing his citations and critical notes in a special appendix arranged according to chapters. This frees the pages of the text from footnotes but still makes numerous references accessible to the critical reader. The list of Books Consulted and Quoted at the end of the volume is in itself a valuable bibliography for the student of American history.

In his portrayal of the political and economic weakness of the colonies, the author presents a gloomy picture of the general run of Americans of the Revolutionary period. He is perhaps too much disposed to attribute the small numbers of the Continental Army and the general financial distress to the stupidity of the leaders of Congress and the general lack of patriotism among the people. Here he seems to have given but slight weight to Washington's own careful review of the primary cause for the delays and disasters of the war, contained in his letter of August 20, 1780, to the President of Congress. In that letter Washington attributed the prolongation of the war and all of the resulting financial and social distresses to the fact that when the army was first formed in 1775, the enlistments were for one year and not for the duration of the war. In an earlier letter to Congress he had said, "When the army was first raised at Cambridge, I am persuaded the men might have been got without bounty for the War." The formation of an adequate army was perfectly feasible at the beginning. It was never feasible later. Had it been so formed, we have Washington's own word for it, the war must have ended in decisive victory long before the summer of 1780.

But whatever the reasons may have been, the actual Washington was forced to bear the burden of war with an inadequate army of ill-paid, ill-clad, and ill-armed men. And it is this actual Washington, all but overwhelmed with difficulties, who is portrayed in this book as he has never been portrayed before.

Most readers will have one complaint against Mr. Hughes. His accounts of some of the battles in which Washington commanded are not illustrated by satisfactory maps. For the battles of Trenton and Princeton, he reproduces a map from Wilkinson's *Memoirs* which gives little aid to the reader of his narrative. For the Battle of Monmouth he reproduces General Clinton's own map. This, though a most interesting historical document, gives little aid in following the movements of the American forces before and during the engagement. A map showing the positions of Lee's forces before the engagement is essential to any comprehension of the battle.

Washington, D. C. JOHN MCAULEY PALMER.

The Complete Journal of Townsend Harris, first American Consul General and Minister to Japan. Introduction and Notes by MARIO EMILIO COSENZA, PH.D., Professor of Classical Languages, the College of the City of New York. [Published for the Japan Society.] (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 1930. Pp. xix, 616. $5.00.)

THE College of the City of New York is fortunate in the possession of the Townsend Harris papers. They comprise, according to the statement of Professor Cosenza, the editor of the book under review, four volumes of journals, five large letter books, and "hundreds of original manuscript letters" received by Harris. Other collections of Harris papers include a small but interesting group of Harris's letters in the New York Public Library, and the original dispatches in the Department of State. There is also a large collection of unofficial papers in Japanese in the possession of the Hotta family in Japan. They comprise the papers of Hotta Bitchiu-no-Kami whose function in the Japanese government when Townsend Harris came to Japan was very roughly equivalent to that of foreign minister. They will throw much new light on the work of Harris in Japan. Professor Cosenza has edited only the four volumes of the journal, using other papers in the City College as needed for footnotes. The volume is published for the Japan Society of New York.

The inclusive dates of the journal thus presented are May 21, 1855, and June 9, 1858, concluding with the negotiations of the Commercial Treaty of 1858, but not including the signing of the treaty which took place the following 29th of July. The journal therefore covers a brief period before the appointment of Harris as consul general to Japan, and the negotiation of the second treaty with Siam, 1856, but does not cover the major part of Harris's diplomatic service in Yedo where he remained until 1862.

The editor is professor of classical languages at the College of the City of New York. He approaches his task, therefore, less as an historian or student of the politics of the Far East, than as a classical scholar, an alumnus of the college which Harris helped into being, and as an enthusiastic admirer of the man. Dr. Cosenza is handicapped by un-

familiarity with the stage on which Harris played the stellar rôle and unfamiliarity, also, with the methods and resources available to students of diplomatic history. The editing has been done with obvious care and conscience and yet the footnotes carry many suppositions and alleged mysteries which could have been readily cleared up by reference to other source material easily available.

By the publication of this journal the former portraiture of Townsend Harris is not greatly modified. Dr. W. E. Griffis used this manuscript collection as the primary source for his biography of Harris published in 1895. Dr. Griffis also gave to the Library of Congress a typewritten manuscript copy of the journal which has been available for many years. There yet remains the task, and the opportunity, to write a critical biography of the man which, while leaving his fame undimmed, will take into account phases of his conduct that, once known, have to be explained. Harris was a more human person than he yet appears to be from anything which has been published about him. His statesmanship, likewise, deserves more critical attention than it has received. At this point a caution is in order. The Hotta manuscripts in Japan are now in the process of being translated into English. They are understood to reveal the Japanese side of the story in a very convincing manner. Many of Harris's charges of bad faith fall to the ground when one knows what the Japanese government had supposed it was agreeing to in the Perry treaty. The task of translation is peculiarly formidable and will require several more years for completion. Meanwhile the student will do well to make no final judgments on either Harris or the Japanese with whom he dealt.

Professor Cosenza has done a faithful work and has dug in the desert a well to which many will come with gratitude. Viewing the subject broadly, however, one may question whether the best choice was made of a subject to enhance the memory of Harris. The latter's most important literary output was his dispatches to the Secretary of State. Very few of them have been published although they have long been available. Professor Cosenza might have made them the basis of his editing and have used the journals as source material to embroider his footnotes. The net result would have been a more valuable contribution made at little or no greater cost of money or labor. Harris was an even greater statesman than is revealed by his journals.

Washington, D. C. TYLER DENNETT.

Abraham Lincoln: a Cartoon History. By ALBERT SHAW. Volume I., *The Path to the Presidency*; volume II., *The Year of his Election.* (New York: Review of Reviews Corporation. 1929. Pp. xiii, 263; 277. $8.00.)

THIS work is in the main an appeal by word and picture to a popular audience. The text is not a compact well-organized narrative but rather an informal chatty compilation of the best secondary works in the field. The author has culled his materials from the highways, if not the byways.

of the vast world of *Lincolniana*. Beveridge, Rhodes, Halstead, Herndon, Barton, and a dozen more writers are drawn upon for material in more or less lengthy excerpts.

It would be unfair to expect much in the way of new contribution from a work of this type. The account is on the whole catholic and sound. The author does not exploit the legends and tales that have so often afflicted Lincoln items. Nor is every new development presented as one of the successive steps in an inevitable Lincoln destiny. Some readers will naturally wish for more Lincoln material and less general background, especially in view of the fact that many developments in the career of the Illinois rail-splitter have been ignored or only briefly stated.

There is a long digression (I. 34–50) on the party politics of the twenty years preceding Lincoln's political activities in Illinois which after all does not succeed in explaining Lincoln's early political affiliations. Indeed, the author fails to present accurately the essentials of the Whig position when he identifies it as virtually the same thing as National Republicanism (I. 51). Again, as a result of accepting the findings of Channing, Rives, Smith, and Stephenson in justification of the Mexican War, the author glosses over Lincoln's opposition to this policy of the Polk administration and fails to indicate its bearing upon Lincoln's retirement from active politics in the years that followed. Moreover, in rejecting the Whig and Abolition theory that it was a war of conquest instigated by a greedy slave power, one may properly question whether the war does find complete justification in the circumstances of its origin.

In the field of the general narrative, the author exposes himself to challenge as to the accuracy of the charge of Van Buren's nailing "his pro-slavery flag to the mast" with his inaugural address (I. 64), and as to Tyler's lack of genuine Whig status (I. 99), and as to the enactment of the Compromise of 1850 as a single bill (I. 161). The time is rapidly approaching when some historical scholar will have to make clear that there was no "Compromise of 1850" in fact: that Clay's proposals had failed; that the "Omnibus Bill" had in the rough going lost all its items but one; and that when the five statutes were enacted which corresponded in scope with the Clay Compromise, each passed on its merits in the absence of any generally prevailing spirit of compromise. As a result, in spite of this legislation, the disunion crisis of 1850–1851 proved to be a serious forerunner of the secession crisis of ten years later.

It is of doubtful wisdom to reprint the letter of December 22, 1859, to John J. Crittenden, which was originally published by Judd Stewart (1909) and later included in the Tracy collection, but concerning the authenticity of which there is grave doubt. But these may be minor matters. For the general reader this work, with the well-tempered narrative and the occasional philosophical comments of a publicist whose storehouse of wisdom shows the harvest of a long and distinguished career, will doubtless become a standard in Lincoln literature. To the historical scholar its chief value lies in the large list of contemporary illustrations, mainly cartoons, that are reprinted in its pages. These

constitute valuable source material concerning the trends of public opinion; it is unfortunate that the cuts are not listed in a table of contents. These cartoons overlap somewhat the material brought out by Brentano in 1918, entitled *American Caricatures Pertaining to the Civil War (1856–1872)*.

Western Reserve University. ARTHUR C. COLE.

John Charles Frémont: an Explanation of his Career. By CARDINAL GOODWIN. (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press. 1930. Pp. 285. $4.00.)

THE highly controversial career of Frémont will long be a subject for historical study. Materials are still slowly appearing—the reviewer has collected many new letters within the last two years. All who are interested in the subject must be grateful for Mr. Goodwin's contribution to the riddle. He has not written a full biography, but has contented himself with focusing his main attention upon three critical parts of Frémont's life: the Bear Flag War in California, the command of the Department of the West in St. Louis in 1861, and the unfortunate railroad ventures following the war. In dealing with the first he has relied, aside from materials in print, upon manuscripts in the Bancroft collections at Berkeley; in dealing with the second, upon government documents and the recent work of Dr. Shannon upon military administration in the Civil War; and in treating the third, upon the reports of Congressional investigators regarding the tangled affairs of the Memphis, El Paso, and Pacific Railroad. No new facts of a striking character are developed; in fact, there is a surprising paucity of really fresh information. But marshaling his material in great detail, Dr. Goodwin offers an interesting and at some points able interpretation of them.

The interpretation is consistently and unrelentingly hostile to Frémont. Dr. Goodwin deals with the problem, always difficult and here dangerous, of character; and he unqualifiedly condemns Frémont. Whether the facts justify his severity is a subject on which men will continue to disagree as they disagreed in 1850 and 1870. No one can read the familiar evidence without feeling that it indicts Frémont's intellect severely; but does it really indict his integrity? At some points Mr. Goodwin appears to display prejudice. Twice (pp. 13, 142) he submits accusations against Frémont's chastity which are supported by no real evidence, and which are in total defiance of everything else we know of the man. It seems unreasonable to blame him because he did not denounce Kit Carson for taking the scalp of a murdering Indian. Carson may be blamed, but surely not Frémont, who was not present or in control of his scout. In writing of 1861, Dr. Goodwin says that it must be admitted that Frémont was "criminally careless, unpardonably extravagant, and that grave doubts as to his honesty are justified". Careless—yes; victimized—very probably; but that he was dishonest there is no shred of evidence to prove, and every circumstance makes the accusation in-

credible. Dr. Goodwin pronounces Frémont a "vagrant", a "drifter", and in morals a "loose constructionist". To the reviewer, Frémont's deficiencies were of common sense, not of morals. Far from being a drifter, his great fault was that he acted constantly upon hot impulse. He was a dreamer, unfit for positions of great responsibility; but it is hard to believe that Jessie Benton could have given lifelong worship to any but an honorable man. The volume is the ablest statement of the case against Frémont yet made. But at no point does it clinch its chief accusations beyond dissent, and its criticism would have been more effective if less extreme.

Columbia University. ALLAN NEVINS.

The Kingdom of Saint James: a Narrative of the Mormons. By MILO M. QUAIFE, Secretary, Burton Historical Collection, Detroit. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1930. Pp. 284. $4.00.)

WHEN Robert Louis Stevenson wrote his history of recent happenings in Samoa he entitled his book *A Footnote to History*. Dr. Quaife's *Kingdom of Saint James* may in like fashion be called a footnote both to the history of Wisconsin and Michigan and to the history of Mormonism in the United States. It was while the author was in the Wisconsin Historical Society that he became interested in the singular career of James J. Strang, called by a former Wisconsin author a "Moses of the Mormons". The colossal assumptions of this Mormon leader stimulated Mr. Quaife's curiosity and for some years he has searched with great diligence for all existing sources that throw light on both the man and his followers. He rescued from oblivion the *Voree Herald* and the *Northern Islander*, successive organs of the theocracy; he found the boyhood diary of Strang; he unearthed a number of copies of the *Book of the Law of the Lord*, based like the *Book of Mormon* on metallic plates, revealed to the prophet by angelic vision. He also visited and secured the reminiscences of a number of Strang's descendants and a few remaining followers yet living in Wisconsin.

After going to Michigan the author studied in detail Strang's political career in that state's legislature, and his aspirations to be sent to Congress. These political activities explain in large part the opposition to the Kingdom of St. James on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan and the treasonable character of the man, who while acting as the people's representative, formulated a code demanding absolute obedience to himself as "King of the Earth by direct appointment of God".

Mr. Quaife aptly characterizes the followers of King Strang and the subjects of his kingdom in Roosevelt's telling phrase, the "lunatic fringe of Society". There were at the height of Strang's power twenty-six hundred such followers most of whom were simple-minded, honest dupes led away by the transcendent claims of the prophet who became king and duly impressed by his coronation, when clad in a robe of bright red he had placed on his brow "a crown of metal with stars in front".

Even though Strang may have been in some measure self-deluded, that does not condone the absurdities of his actions. On the other hand he was in some degree a "benevolent" despot, in advance of his time on matters of personal hygiene, health regulations, conservation of natural resources, and the prohibition of the use of liquor. His economic provisions were less effective and for the most part his subjects were wretchedly poor and lived in great destitution on their island home. It was his absolutism in sumptuary decrees and in the regulation of the minutiæ of his subjects' daily life together with the introduction and practice of polygamy that wrought his downfall, after he had been ten years a prophet and for five had worn the robes and responsibilities of royalty. He was assassinated by his own followers and after his death his subjects were driven into exile by the "gentiles" of the vicinity, with whom Strang had previously had several serious clashes.

The narrative is by turns amusing and tragic, nearly always incredible were it not for the evidence of the documents. Mr. Quaife has given it just the proper fillip by an ironical style, with satirical comment and allusion.

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

SHORTER NOTICES

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Editor-in-Chief, Edwin R. A. Seligman; Associate Editor, Alvin Johnson. Volume II., Alliance-Brigandance. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1930, pp. xxvi, 696, $7.50.) The task of the historian is to recover past episodes or developments and to reconstruct vanished civilizations. More and more he borrows from the social sciences techniques, principles, and knowledge. Volume II. of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* makes such borrowing easier. The man whose problems include the study of undeveloped peoples will find in the article on anthropology a summary of the evolution of anthropological thought and a statement, somewhat warped by the influence of a particular school, regarding current anthropological practice. The student of economic history will find useful aids in the rather extensive group of articles dealing with aviation, the automobile industry, balance of trade, banking, the American Federation of Labor, anarchism, and bolshevism. The investigator of religious thought and institutions will welcome the articles on atheism, anti-clericalism, Brahmanism, and Hinduism. Occasionally the historian will find articles which fall within his own bailiwick such as the series of three on archives and those on the Articles of Confederation, the Anti-Corn Law League, and Alsace-Lorraine.

Much of the material in this volume may be found in a general encyclopedia. Why multiply reference apparatus? The volume under review seems to present the editors' answer to such a question. The

limitation of the scope of this work makes possible on the one hand a fuller discussion of general subjects and on the other a nicer discrimination in the subdivision of the fields of thought. So anti-militarism is discussed as something different from pacifism and anti-radicalism as distinct from conservatism. Such discriminations make for clarity of thought on the problems arising out of human society.

To a surprising degree the policy of the editors is reflected in the diverse articles of volume II. Wherever such a method is appropriate the contributor traces the evolution of thought in his particular field from the beginning to the present and then proceeds to a survey of current opinion. Although the authors seem to have been docile enough to accept the editorial pattern for their contributions, they have not always been able to suppress their private predilections and prejudices. The historian who wanders into this repository of fact and theory will do well to take his principles of historical criticism with him.

One of the aspects of editorial policy that seems to be of doubtful wisdom is the inclusion of biographies. The space occupied by what are for the most part little better than thumb-nail sketches could have been utilized to better advantage. Volume II. of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences,* however, is, in spite of the criticisms, a notable addition to a notable series.

Yale University. RALPH HENRY GABRIEL.

Der Untergang Roms im Abendländischen Denken: ein Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung und zum Dekadenzproblem. Von Walther Rehm. [*Das Erbe der Alten: Schriften über Wesen und Wirkung der Antike.* Zweite Reihe. Gesammelt und herausgegeben von Otto Immisch. Heft XVIII.] (Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930, pp. viii, 176, 6.50 M.) All that lives, because it lives must also die. "Nos âmes se sont corrompues à mesure que nos sciences et nos arts se sont avancés à la perfection." Such thoughts are decadence ideas. The concept and sentiment of decadence have reappeared in various forms in European thought, and have turned to the fall of Rome as a great spectacle the account of which gave them free scope, and the cause of which it was their special function to explain. And, in revenge, the contemplation of the decline of ancient culture has built up the feeling and consciousness of decadence. Thus a long conversation, begun even before the event by Polybius, has been carried on by leading thinkers of the West, each of them explaining and depicting that event in accordance with his idea of decadence, and, in doing so, enriching and enlarging that concept to accord with the intellectual and emotional content of his times. It is this conversation which is here recounted. The book is not strictly speaking a survey of the historiography of the fall of Rome. Like Dr. Rehm's two previous books it is a product of the type of philosophical literary research inspired by Dilthey.

Spengler's *Decline of the West* has widely advertised the interest of post-war Germany in decadence. Rehm does not mention Spengler. His report of the European discussion about Rome does not extend beyond Nietzsche, the last, he says, to speak "in representative fashion". But, whether deliberately or not, Dr. Rehm provides a background against which one might attempt to place Spengler. Yet most readers will not find in that fact the main value of this interesting book. It is a long and narrow strip which Dr. Rehm has cut through the "seamless robe of history", but it occasionally reveals with surprising clearness how the pattern of men and thoughts has been woven together. The juxtaposition of the views upon this one subject of such thinkers as Otto of Freising, Petrarch, Rousseau, and Gibbon brings into relief how differently men have thought of man.

The Johns Hopkins University. FREDERIC C. LANE.

The Life of Mahomet. By Émile Dermenghem. (New York, Dial Press, 1930, pp. xii, 353, $5.00.) This book in its frankly popular appeal fills a gap. Those of us who are concerned seriously with the problem of Mohammed and with the beginnings of Islam are often puzzled when we are asked to recommend a fairly trustworthy book for the information of a reader who has no intention of specializing, or even as an introduction for one who may perhaps, if interested, read further and more deeply. The available books are either old and out of date, or heavy with details and controversy, or prejudiced and one-sided—in one direction or the other, or light-minded, or all these things at once. But M. Dermenghem's book, while readable, has also a solid basis; it is plain that he knows the "sources" although he almost never refers to them. He is careful, too, to suggest different sides and possibilities; his reader who wishes to go further will have little to unlearn. It is, in fact, astonishing how many details have been worked artistically into these few pages of large type. The handling, too, chapter by chapter, is vivid and skillful; the true emphasis of topic is kept, from the beginning, with an account of Selman, the Persian, as the background of Islam, to the death of the Prophet amid rumors of the appearance of farcical imitators. It is evidently of the plan of the book to give very few footnotes—those given are plainly afterthoughts, supplementing and correcting—and no bibliographical references. A map would have been a help for the reader, but we may be glad that there has been no attempt at pseudo-illustrations. The translating has been well done, although *Pierre le Vénérable* should be, in English, just Peter the Venerable. A curious misprint in both text and index (pp. 121, 344) is Droughty for Doughty. It is interesting to note that the French original is listed at fifteen francs.

Hartford Theological Seminary. D. B. MACDONALD.

The Hundred and the Hundred Rolls: an Outline of Local Government in Medieval England. By Helen M. Cam, Fellow and Lecturer of Girton

College, Cambridge. (London, Methuen and Company, 1930, pp. xv, 296, 15 s.) The purpose of this book, the author says, is "to provide a guide to the study of the three great volumes of the *Rotuli Hundredorum* and *Placita Quo Warranto* printed early in the nineteenth century, and to give a sketch of the local governmental system at work in the reign of Edward I". In the opinion of the reviewer, Miss Cam has well attained her object. Her discussion is clear and adequate, her chapters nicely organized, her style simple and pleasing. Her volume has no pretention of being more than it is—a somewhat popular work of description and illustration, like the other volumes that have appeared in the series of *The Antiquary's Books*.

Brief chapters trace the development of local administration from the Norman Conquest to the accession of Edward I. and serve to introduce his great inquests. These are then treated in detail: the procedure followed, the records made, and the use to which they were put. Appendixes give the articles of inquiry, name the commissioners, list the hundreds with their lords, and index the unpublished rolls. But the meat of the volume is a full analysis of the materials embraced in the returns of 1274–1275, arranged under two main heads: the work of the shire and the work of the hundred.

Here the reader may find a wealth of information on sheriffs, coroners, constables, bailiffs, beadles, serjeants, and the other officials whose usefulness to the king was equaled only by their unpopularity throughout the countryside. He may learn much of courts, lawsuits, and executions; of taxes, fines, and accounts; of police, musters, and public works. And incidentally he will meet a choice array of thirteenth century tyrants, grafters, and racketeers.

There is the castellan at Scarborough who lured the burgesses' pigs within his precincts by scattering corn outside the walls. There is the sheriff who taxed the men of Cambridgeshire for a stone bridge, but put up a wooden one, and then paid a man to pull off the planks at night so that people would be forced to use his official ferry. There are the lords of hundreds who virtually licensed infraction of the royal assize of bread and beer by doing a thriving business in fines.

Less famous than the Domesday inquest, the Hundred Rolls are even richer in illustrations of governmental practice and village psychology. They throw a flood of light, untinged with rose, upon actual conditions under the "English Justinian". It is the great merit of Miss Cam's book that it will reveal to a host of historically minded but technically unequipped students one of the many neglected phases of medieval life.

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

The Mines of Mendip. By J. W. Gough, M.A., Lecturer in History at the University of Bristol. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. viii, 269, $5.00.) The lead mines of the Mendip Hills have a long history reaching back to pre-Roman Britain, but despite the length of

their history they always occupied a somewhat secondary position because of the relative inferiority of the ores in quantity and in quality. Methods of mining were relatively primitive even at a late date and scarce any notable technical improvements were associated with this district. The organization of the industry was similar in many respects to that developed in the Cornish tin mines, but the customs were written down at a later date and with rather less detail. This careful monograph on the region will thus have a somewhat limited appeal, though it makes available much new material and presents a thorough discussion of the curiously confused texts of the mining customs.

The region has been classified in the past as one of the "free" mining districts, but the present study shows clearly that the rights of the miners were much less significant than they were in the jurisdiction of the stannary courts in Cornwall. Rights of "free" mining developed at an early date out of the rights of common over the Mendip forest, and for this reason the rights were subject to the manorial jurisdiction of not less than four landlords, who finally emerged as "Lords Royal". Although the commons embraced a large section of the more easily workable sites, they did not comprise the entire area, and the lords were successful in converting the mining and smelting of lead into a source of manorial revenue that was at times of substantial importance. From a jurisdictional point of view there is therefore much of special interest in the local customs, but the significance will be fully evident only to readers who are familiar with conditions in other mining areas.

Apparently little use was made of these ores during the Saxon period or immediately after the Norman Conquest, but the lead works became important again during the thirteenth century and thereafter constituted an important phase of local activity until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the workings became impracticable on account of water at depths of twenty or thirty fathoms. The ores did not justify the setting up of pumping machinery, whether operated by horse or steam, and the region thus contributed little to the history of the technique of mining. Lead mining was abandoned in the eighteenth century, though some work continued on zinc carbonates known as calamine. In the second half of the nineteenth century companies were formed for the reworking of the slag heaps of the old mines, which still contained about twenty per cent. of metal. The development of rich foreign deposits and further improvements in technique made the working of these small quantities unprofitable and forced the companies out of business. Production fell off rapidly after 1875, though some work continued until 1908.

Harvard University. ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

The Alpine Passes: the Middle Ages, 962–1250. By J. E. Tyler. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1930, pp. 188, 8 s. 6 d.) This excellent study by a lecturer in Modern history at the University of Sheffield is the outgrowth of an essay on a similar subject which won the Lothian Prize at

Oxford in 1926. It tells all that can be gleaned of the Alpine routes between the coronation of Otto I. and the death of Frederick II. from scattered references in chronicles, itineraries of travelers, known halting places of German emperors, etc. It is well articulated into seventeen chapters, the bulk of the text (V.–XIV.) being concerned with the history and geography of the various passes. Thus three chapters deal with the Western Group, extending from the Col di Tenda in the Maritime Alps northward to the Simplon over the single main chain; three with the Central Group, between the Simplon and the Reschen-Scheideck, over two parallel chains separated by the Upper Rhone and the Vorderrhein; and four with the Eastern Group, from the Reschen-Scheideck eastward, necessitating the traverse of three to five ridges. The last three chapters deal with the Passes as Trade-routes from the revival of European commerce in the tenth century after the Scandinavian incursions ended in 912 with the cession of Normandy to Rollo, and after the defeat of the Magyars in 955, long the scourge of Germany and Lombardy.

The subject treated is a little known, though important, section of Medieval history. The attempt of Otto I. and his successors to unite Germany and Italy, and that of Conrad the Salic and his followers to add Burgundy made the Alpine routes links in a tripartite empire. Their importance was not only political and strategic, but also economic, since they connected the industrial and commercial centers of Italy with those of Western Europe. Thus a knowledge of them throws light on many medieval problems, such as the character of the spiritual supremacy of Rome, the understanding of the imperial attempts to make the control of Italy real, the understanding of medieval commerce, etc.

The four introductory chapters are the most interesting to the lay reader. Thus the one on the Ordinary Traveller in the Alps treats of such subjects as the lack of road building plans in the medieval period, and consequent use of the old Roman roads, now long out of repair; of the dangers to travelers from avalanches, storms, snowdrifts, lack of supplies and shelter, and robbery; of the gradual rise, in consequence of the crusades, of inns and hospices on the passes and along the continental roads leading to them, to do the work before done by the monasteries; of the type of travelers who were always bent on business and never on pleasure, whether ecclesiastics, merchants, soldiers, actors, jugglers, jesters, strolling musicians, etc.

The bibliography and exhaustive documentation make the work valuable for reference and source material.

The University of Pennsylvania. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 1208–1265. By Charles Bémont, Membre de l'Institut (Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres). A new edition, translated by E. F. Jacob. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. xxxix, 303, $4.50.) For nearly half a century, M. Bémont's thesis, published in 1884, has been regarded as the authoritative

life of Simon de Montfort. Although there has been much investigating and writing about all phases of the times in which Simon lived, M. Bémont's biography has not been supplanted. Now, a completely revised new edition printed only in English, prepared by the learned author himself, gives this important book the assurance of prolonged life and usefulness. Of the *pièces justificatives*, consisting of more than a hundred pages in the thesis, only the will of Simon has been reprinted. Four new documents have been added, as well as genealogical tables and descriptions of the Montfort seals. The bibliography has been made longer, and is a better selected list of titles than that found in the first edition. The new book is made more attractive than its predecessor by the use of illustrations.

On the whole, although the author has added some new material, such as new facts about the town and earldom of Leicester, or the situation in Gascony, the main thread of the story and its conclusions have not been greatly changed. We know little more about the hero than we did before, and wonder how a self-seeking thirteenth century baron became the leader of a popular cause. Perhaps the earl's friendship with Grosseteste and Adam Marsh worked a change in his character. The evidence is too vague to show just how Simon's ideas were changed. The author does not force us to believe more than the documents tell.

How much did Simon contribute to the founding of the House of Commons? On page 230, the author says that to-day no one would call him the founder of this institution. The conclusion sums up Simon's work as follows:

> Two years after Evesham the Statute of Marlborough embodied part of the Provisions of Oxford, which consequently became the law of England, instead of the militant programme of a narrow self-centered party. . . . It was not the factious barons, but Edward himself, who, schooled by his rough experience, turned to lasting profit the precedent created by his uncle, Simon de Montfort. The parliaments he summoned on the morrow of his return in 1275 and above all at the beginning of 1295 were but framed on the ephemeral model of 1265. . . . There is no doubt that we must attribute part of the initiative for this step to Simon de Montfort.

M. Bémont makes no reference to the writ described by G. O. Sayles, (*E. H. R.*, 1925) according to which twenty-seven towns and boroughs were summoned to send representatives to Westminister in 1268, which shows the intention, at least, of Henry III. to repeat Simon's experiment three years after it was made. Why is this evidence unnoticed?

The University of Texas. F. DUNCALF.

Johannis Wyclif: Summa de Ente, Libri Primi, Tractatus Primus et Secundus. Now first edited with critical Introduction and Notes from the two extant Manuscripts by S. Harrison Thomson, Ph.D., B.Litt., Assistant Professor of History, California Institute of Technology, Research Fellow in Medieval History, Henry E. Huntington Library and

Art Gallery. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. xxxvi, 119, $3.50.) Dr. Thomson has placed students of late medieval thought in his debt by the publication of this volume. The third and fourth tractates of book I. of the *Summa de Ente* were edited by Mr. Dziewicki for the Wyclif Society and published in 1909; Dr. Thomson has the fifth and sixth tractates in hand, and he promises that the four unedited tractates of book II. will appear later. It was "to lay before the interested reader Wyclif's philosophy in the order in which he himself thought it should most logically develop" that Dr. Thomson laid aside his work on *De Universalibus* (book I., tractate 5), and devoted himself to the preparation of this volume; once again, wisdom seems to be justified of all her children. Of the two extant codices in which these tractates, (i) *On Being in General* and (ii) *On Prime Being*, are to be found, the one in Trinity College, Cambridge, and the other in the Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, Dr. Thomson has followed the former, despite the adverse judgment on that codex passed by Professor Loserth in his edition of the *Sermones* and reiterated by Mr. Dziewicki; footnotes furnish us with the variant readings.

In the critical introduction, which might well serve as a model for such productions, Dr. Thomson gives a sixteen-page summary of the argument, chapter by chapter, which one reader, at least, all too easily lost in the subtleties of metaphysic, found exceedingly valuable. This, with the indexes at the end of the volume, greatly facilitates the use of the volume.

So far as the content of the tractates is concerned, while Aristotle and Augustine are, as one would expect, the authorities most often quoted or referred to, Wyclif's indebtedness to Anselm is clearly apparent; it is greater than one would gather, for instance, from a reading of Dr. Workman's chapter on Wyclif's Place among the Schoolmen in his *John Wyclif*. On the other hand, the appeal to Holy Writ is made less frequently; as Dr. Thomson says, "Wyclif had not yet become the *Doctor Evangelicus*".

Washington and Jefferson College. A. H. Sweet.

The Origin of the Icelandic Family Sagas. By Knut Liestöl. Translated from the Norwegian by A. G. Jayne. (Oslo, Aschehoug, 1930, pp. 261, 5.50 kr.) It is generally agreed that the events recorded in the Icelandic family sagas occurred (if they did occur) during the century closing about 1030, and that the completed sagas began to take written form about 1120. There remains the important question as to what extent they suffered changes during the three or four generations of oral tradition.

The most recent contribution to the discussion of this problem is a masterly study of sagas and folk tales by Knut Liestöl, which was presented in a series of lectures delivered at the Institute for the Comparative Study of Culture in Oslo. The author believes that the men who

told the stories originally tried to state the facts as they understood them; but he admits quite freely that, as the stories passed down through a century of tradition, they suffered corruption in various ways. Variant forms of the tales were combined; dramatic incidents were introduced into the narrative; conversations were invented; and the saga was often recast so as to make it conform to the demands of current literary conventions.

A skeleton, and often considerably more than a skeleton, was left, which the historian can accept as quite reliable in its information. For Liestöl argues rather cogently that conditions in Iceland were such as to discourage any extensive tampering with the fabric of tradition. The population of the island was small and scattered; there were almost no books in the settlements and the islanders had to depend for entertainment chiefly on tales from their own districts, which they doubtless heard told many times. At the same time the ramifications of the kindred were quite extensive, and no doubt the kinsmen knew the exploits of their family long before they heard them recited by the story-tellers. These were what might be called professional men: they learned their stories by heart and told them to the end of their lives. For these and other reasons which the author presents, it was, therefore, not so easy to give currency to fictitious details. "Only on the assumption that the Icelandic family saga claims to be, and *is*, history in the mediaeval sense can we really understand it." It is not likely that those who regard the sagas as works of literary art only will accept this dictum; but it seems quite clear that their stronghold has been seriously shaken and will need rebuilding.

The University of Illinois. L. M. Larson.

Martin Luther: von Katholizismus zur Reformation. Von Dr. Otto Scheel, Professor an der Universität Kiel. Band II., *Im Kloster.* Third and fourth editions. (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1930, pp. xii, 694, 33.60 M.) What Lucien Febvre terms the third great offensive movement of Catholic scholarship on the German Reformation, that initiated by Denifle and supported by Grisar, had of necessity to find answer. Prerequisite were years of arduous study in a vast world, almost untraveled by Protestant scholars, of scholastic and late medieval theology. For the rehabilitation and the renewed historic justification of Luther many have already credited Otto Scheel.

Planned on the grand scale as a history of Luther in four volumes, Scheel's work is yet incomplete. But the reason is not far to seek. The whole work must stand or fall by the measure of its success in recording the genesis and formation in school, university, and cloister of the principal genius of the Reformation. This task was undertaken in the first two volumes. Since their timely publication in 1916–1917, reviews, articles, and books have swarmed about the scholarly work, necessitating new and revised editions. The transformation in the volume before us, already in 1917 a book of 458 pages but now thickened by half as many again, speaks amply of the increase of knowledge, the heat of controversy, and the importance of the problem.

Im Kloster concerns ten years of Luther's life. How much is known of his experience in these years? We know him, of course, as novice, priest, theological student, and at Erfurt, Wittenberg, Rome. But much that once passed as knowledge Scheel throws overboard as "Luther legends": untrustworthy are the earliest biographers, the *Tischreden*, Luther's reminiscences. The environment fills the canvas instead; rich the descriptions of the *milieus* of Erfurt and Wittenberg, long and courageous the grappling with currents of theology and dogma.

So normal does Luther emerge! How came he then to his great discovery, his world-shaking mission? Through something transcendental it must be. "Vollends unmöglich ist es, unter Verzicht auf Nachweise die Entwicklung Luthers zum Reformator zu schildern." So bows the Lutheran biographer, not unwillingly, to Revelation. What we miss is a finely controlled historical imagination competent to work its way among deep psychological issues.

Duke University. ERNEST W. NELSON.

The Tragedy of Kirk o' Field. By Major-General R. H. Mahon, C.B., C.S.I. (Cambridge, University Press, 1930, pp. xviii, 285, 16 s.) This is the last of three books devoted by the late Major General Mahon to the vindication of Mary Stuart. The first (1923) was a short and scholarly study of a manuscript in the Cambridge University Library, having to do with Buchanan's indictment of her. The second (1924) was a series of essays dealing with various aspects of her career, including a portrait of her as a frail and injured woman, and an analysis of the casket letters which, in the light of the Lang-Henderson controversy on that subject, must be pronounced unsound. The third is before us—a posthumous publication, but completed before the author died.

It is an astonishing book. Mary's friends have labored for hundreds of years to establish her innocency of the murder of her husband at Kirk o' Field, but none of them has ever gone to quite the length of this her latest champion. His position is briefly as follows: The gunpowder plot of Kirk o' Field was arranged by Darnley and his father at the instigation of papal agents to destroy Mary and her Protestant counselors, Darnley intending to escape from the house before the train was fired. The plot miscarried, and Darnley himself in the act of escaping was murdered by some one of his many enemies.

This topsy-turvy view of the matter is the more remarkable since it is based upon no new evidence, but simply upon a reinterpretation of evidence already well known, and for the most part in print. General Mahon is not satisfied that any one of the actors in the Kirk o' Field tragedy told the whole truth. Probably no one else is. But that reason seems hardly adequate for a completely new version of the affair based largely upon surmise and conjecture. There can be no doubt that militant Romanists were dissatisfied with Mary's temporizing attitude toward Scottish Protestantism, but that is a long way from justifying the asser-

tion that papal agents were actively plotting her destruction. It is on such shaky foundations as these that General Mahon has sought to establish his case. He virtually ignores the casket letters, the most damaging of all the evidence against Mary, and he attributes her subsequent marriage to Bothwell to a kind of enchantment practiced by an unscrupulous man upon a tender and trusting woman. It would not be difficult to pick his argument to pieces in detail, but it would hardly be worth while. Plainly we have to do here, as we have to do so often when the lovely and unfortunate Queen of Scots is in question, not with sober history, but with knight errantry, decked in the paraphernalia of scholarship. General Mahon was none of your cold, impartial analysts of historical evidence. He was a gallant gentleman and there was a lady in distress.

Philadelphia. CONYERS READ.

The Seventeenth-Century Sheriff: a Comparative Study of the Sheriff in England and the Chesapeake Colonies, 1607–1689. By Cyrus Harreld Karraker, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Birmingham-Southern College. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1930, pp. xv, 219, $2.50.) It is unfortunate that Professor Karraker was not satisfied to give his able and learned little treatise the subtitle rather than the imposing one of *The Seventeenth-Century Sheriff*. To do more than skim the milk in sixty pages on the English sheriff of that century is virtually an impossibility. But for the purpose of comparing this official with his colonial cousin, the author has gathered sufficient material from English sources, official and otherwise, to give students of local government in both countries a valuable dissertation.

The book is divided into three parts. The first describes the English sheriff under such headings as Qualifications and Appointment, Court Service, Financial Duties, etc. The second follows this official in the Chesapeake colonies with greater detail under similar headings. And the third part consists of twenty-six documents illustrative of the sheriff on both sides of the Atlantic. Finally, there is an excellent bibliography and an index, which omits too much to be called adequate.

As might be expected, the most interesting part of this careful study is the conclusions, that is, the divergencies and similarities which are manifest in comparing officials of the same name in two so widely separated countries during the first century of American colonial history. Professor Karraker has found sheriffs in both countries fundamentally the same. But differences there were bound to be. As the author says: "The more pronounced divergencies in the colonies group themselves under six heads: the increase in financial powers; the lack of judicial functions; the temporary loss of election duties; the more purely local than royal and provincial character of the office; the more democratic character of the office; and its more important place in colonial government."

Under the first of these headings Professor Karraker fails, curiously enough, to do justice to the English sheriff as royal revenue collector. It

is more than misleading to say that "feudal rights, rents, fines", etc. "were mere survivals of an early age and generally insignificant" (p. 53), particularly during the first half of the seventeenth century. At least, the House of Commons and James I. did not think so. There are, however, few such slips to mar an otherwise excellent piece of work which should help considerably to stimulate the production of more comparative studies on English and American institutions.

New York University. HAROLD HULME.

Colbert et la Compagnie de Commerce du Nord, 1661–1689. Par P. Boissonnade et P. Charliat. Préface de M. Henri Hauser. (Paris, Marcel Rivière, 1930, pp. 182, 30 fr.) In the middle of the seventeenth century almost all commerce between France and the Baltic was in the hands of the Dutch. By the establishment of direct trade Colbert wished to break this economic dependence, and at the same time to supply French shipyards, to increase French shipping, and to pay for it all with French wines, salt, sugar, and manufactures. After futile efforts to stimulate northern trade in the channel ports, he turned to the West because of the proximity of the goods to be exported and the greater freedom from Dutch influence. An excellent picture is drawn of the methods of persuasion and intimidation used by Colbert to secure capital for the new company. All efforts failed to bring the Bordelais into the enterprise, and La Rochelle and the government bore the heaviest burdens. Several minor enterprises were undertaken to consume the goods imported, and the Spanish and Portuguese markets were exploited.

The most important contribution of the book is to point out the relation between the Company of the North and the Dutch war of 1672. The Hollanders protested that some of the privileges granted the company were breaches of the clause of the treaty of 1662 guaranteeing equal opportunities to the merchants of the two countries. They flooded La Rochelle with northern goods, and they used diplomatic pressure on the Scandinavian governments. Competition became so bitter that war was inevitable.

During the war the use of neutral and even of Dutch ships was resorted to; but activities could not be maintained, and the company and many of the individuals interested in it went down in disaster. Notwithstanding its failure the Company of the North did much to create direct relations between France and the Baltic. After the peace, privately owned French ships resumed the trade and many Scandinavian vessels came to France.

A great deal of information is given about the personalities and the relationships of the individuals involved. The authors have made use of a wide range of materials including the Sound tables and some Scandinavian sources. Thirty-five pages of the most important documents are appended. M. Charliat's interest in naval architecture has led him to add twelve plates illustrating the construction of flutes and pinnaces and re-

producing some documents concerning shipping. This little study is remarkably well done and highly valuable.

Western Reserve University. CLARENCE P. GOULD.

Manuel de Géographie Historique de la France. Par L. Mirot. Préface de Camille Jullian, de l'Académie Française. (Paris, August Picard, 1929, pp. xxiv, 374, 55 fr.) This volume is exactly what its title implies. It is not a book to be read, but a tool to be used. It is intended primarily for the students at the École des Chartes. In a few places there are short passages of illuminating generalization. But in the main it consists of well-arranged and concisely stated details about the manner in which the territory that now constitutes France has been brought together and subdivided for a variety of purposes.

The book is divided into six chapters. The first two deal with the province of Gaul and the kingdom of the Franks. Chapter III. is devoted to the formation of the royal domain from 987 to 1610. It occupies nearly a third of the book and gives in concise form a practically complete list of all the territorial gains and losses experienced by each of the French monarchs in their protracted battle with the feudal nobility. In chapter IV. the territorial outcome of all the wars France has fought since 1610 is given in the briefest possible outline. Chapters V. and VI. are devoted to the ecclesiastical and administrative subdivisions of the country.

The equipment in maps is on the whole admirable and is probably as good as could be provided at low cost. There are forty-four maps, each on a separate sheet of thin paper. All are in black and white. As the average size is only about four square inches and as all but six represent the entire area of France or more, the scale is necessarily small. Clarity has been attained, nevertheless, in all but two or three instances. The index is in every respect admirable. It consists of sixty-eight double-columned pages and affords quick access to any item mentioned in the text. M. Camille Jullian has contributed an interesting preface in which he pays tribute to the pioneers in the production of French historical and geographical manuals.

Although the author expressly disclaims any intention of presenting new knowledge and frankly describes his book as resting on the research of Longnon, Vidal de la Blache, Schrader, and other masters in the field of geographical research, his book is a striking example of the exact and minute knowledge which can be produced only by one who has carried on long and painstaking research according to the highest standards of scientific work.

Dartmouth College. FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

An Economic History of Europe, 1760–1930. By Arthur Birnie, M.A., Lecturer in Economic History in the University of Edinburgh. (New York, Dial Press, 1930, pp. xi, 289, $4.00.) This volume adds another

able work to the list of economic histories of Europe since the Industrial Revolution. The avowed purpose of the author is "to describe and emphasize the outstanding features in the economic development of Europe during the last hundred and fifty years"; and he feels that this can be accomplished best by confining the treatment almost exclusively to the industrialized countries. On the whole this concentration on Great Britain, France, and Germany may be justifiable; but since the book ends with an account of the Russian Revolution it is difficult to understand why some attention was not given to the industrial development of Russia.

Mr. Birnie has not followed the common practice of dividing this century and a half into periods and of devoting separate chapters to the important economic changes in each country. Instead he has chosen to treat these years as a unit and to devote each chapter to tracing the historical development of some economic phase in Great Britain, France, and Germany. Excluding the final chapter on Some Recent Economic Tendencies, the volume falls logically into two divisions: the six chapters on the revolutions in industry, agriculture, transport, commerce, commercial policy, and the changes in money, banking, and investment; and the eight chapters on the attempts to deal with the social problems that resulted from these great economic changes.

The chapters treating these revolutions, especially the one on the revolution in commerce, are very well done; and the description of the economic organization and society before the Industrial Revolution is one of the best features of the book. But when an attempt is made to cover the history of socialism, the labor and coöperative movements, profit sharing and copartnership, the factory and poor laws, and social insurance in the three great industrial countries in one hundred and fifty pages, the ability of the author is severely taxed. Excellent judgment is shown in the selection of the brief list of works suggested for further reading, and in the compact information given in the statistical appendix on population, urbanization, occupations, industrial production, agriculture, foreign commerce, transport, and wealth. On the whole the author has succeeded in describing and emphasizing the outstanding features in the economic development of Europe; but owing to the small size of the volume and to the strictly topical treatment he has not given a clear impression of what any one country, or industrial Europe as a whole, was like in different periods during the hundred and fifty years that he treats.

The University of Washington. DONALD G. BARNES.

Die Organisation der allgemeinen Staatsverwaltung auf dem Linken Rheinufer durch die Franzosen während der Besetzung 1792 bis zum Frieden von Lunéville, 1801. Von Dr. Jur. Ludwig Käss, mit einem Geleitwort von Professor Dr. H. Gmelin. (Mainz, J. Diemer, 1929, pp. xiv, 212, 6.10 M.) Of the foreign territories which were swept within the orbit of French influence and political domination during the Revolutionary era, none bears the traces of this contact as does Germany on the

left bank of the Rhine. While there are several studies treating the long French occupation previous to the settlement of Lunéville, that of Dr. Käss is the first to profess to do so from the standpoint of international law. The major portion of the book, as its title would indeed indicate, is concerned with the immediate problems of the administration of the occupied regions. We are first introduced to Rhenish institutions under the moribund Holy Roman Empire, when the left bank was still dotted with some hundred and fifty separate territories. The war that broke out in 1792, contends the author, was the inevitable consequence of the irreconcilable contrast between the France of the Revolution and feudal Europe, and it was appropriate that the first clash should take place in the awakening Rhineland. The new spirit and the political interests of the French were equally concerned with the administrative reorganization of an area which might be financially exploited as well as prepared for ultimate annexation. Medieval confusion was replaced by a system the best elements of which were later adopted by the more important German states, notably Prussia and Bavaria.

Only in concluding his study does the author return to the announced emphasis upon legal aspects, particularly to the question of whether it was a violation of international law to introduce a new system of administration into an occupied area. The answer is qualified, for the occupation of each bit of territory involved different legal principles. Passing reference is made to the latest Rhineland occupation, which is admitted to have been on an entirely different legal basis, although the political side of the problem, that is to say, the aims and methods of the French Rhineland policy, is proclaimed the same as it was a hundred and thirty years ago.

The book is elaborately organized and the author, who took much of his material from local archives, sometimes tends to lose himself in the maze of detail, a result hardly conducive to easy reading. Its chief usefulness should be as a convenient reference; as such it will certainly take its place among the better studies on the subject.

The University of Minnesota. HAROLD C. DEUTSCH.

Marie de l'Incarnation: Écrits Spirituels et Historiques. Edited by Dom Albert Jamet. Two volumes. (Paris, Desclée, de Brouwer and Company, 1929–1930, pp. 424, 512.) The writings of Mary of the Incarnation were published by her son Dom Claude Martin, but the edition by Dom Albert Jamet is the first to be complete. The present editor, a Benedictine of the abbey of Solesme, has approached his task in a scientific temper, and with a technique and an attention to detail which leave little to be desired. Wherever manuscripts differed in text, or the writings called for a word of explanation, these clarifications have been inserted with a fidelity which testifies to an intense love for the work itself.

The first volume contains, with a general introduction, the writings of the Venerable Mary—in 1911 the Holy See published a decree concerning the heroic character of her virtues—and a story of her life which permits the editor to date the various fragments of which she is the author.

Mary was born at Tours on October 28, 1599. While only seven years old she evinced a desire to enter the religious life. Her mother did not take her seriously, "believing", as she puts it, "that my humor and gaiety were incompatible with the religious life". She was married at the age of eighteen to a silk merchant, Claude Martin, but he died two years later, leaving her with an infant son. It was only in the year 1631, when she was thirty-two that she could realize her fixed desire. She entered the religious life of the Ursulines, and after eight years more went to Canada to found the community there. Her writings, according to Dom Jamet, are: an autobiographical *Relatio* written at Tours in 1633; Letters of conscience dating from 1625–1634; Spiritual notes, 1625–1628; an explanation of the Canticle of Canticles, 1631–1637; Notes on prayer, 1633–1635; an autobiographical Relation, written at Quebec, 1654; a complement to this Autobiography, 1656. She also wrote three or four dictionaries of the Indian language, but these have not come down to us.

These writings constitute the best source book of the missionary background of Canada from 1639 to 1674, with the possible exception of the *Jesuit Relations*. They also touch some of the perplexing problems of the theologian, for here is a woman endowed with excellent health, with a well-equilibrated nervous system, engaged in the most active kind of work, building a monastery in a new land, who is, nevertheless, an ardent mystic, realizing to an extraordinary degree the aspirations of the religious life.

The Catholic University of America. FULTON J. SHEEN.

Les Jansénistes du XVIII^e Siècle et la Constitution Civile du Clergé: le Développement du Richérisme, sa Propagation dans le Bas Clergé, 1713–1791. Par E. Préclin, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur au Lycée Hoche. (Paris, Librairie Universitaire J. Gamber, 1929, pp. xxxi, 578, 50 fr.) This extensively documented, somewhat dry but clearly composed book studies the adoption of the doctrine of Richer by the Jansenists of the eighteenth century and the part they played in the making of the *Constitution Civile du Clergé* in 1790.

Edmond Richer (1560–1631), syndic of the faculty of theology of Paris, fought Ultramontanism and presented a doctrine that was adopted and elaborated by the Jansenists of the eighteenth century. Richer held that the government of the Church is a tempered aristocracy. Episcopacy is essential while papacy is "accessory". The parish priests, inferior to the bishops, have some part in the government of the diocese by the synods, and they vote in the councils. The power of making laws belongs to the priests, not to the laity. Quesnel (1634–1719), disciple of Richer, modified this doctrine by attributing to the laity the right of intervention in three matters: excommunication, the election of priests and bishops, and the confirmation of doctrines. After the bulls *Vineam Domini*, 1705, and *Unigenitus*, 1713, had condemned them, the Jansenists, being clever tacticians, left the field of theology and fought on a new ground, that of Gallicanism.

During the second part of the eighteenth century, the lower clergy, famished and miserable, fought against the prelacy to better its condition. Its syndicalist movement appears to be much more important than the Richerist movement which was then decadent, but the programs coincide. M. Préclin believes, but admits that he can not prove, that Richerism was slowly "incubated" by the lower clergy and provided the cahiers prepared for the States-General with "the indispensable doctrinal basis".

Contrary to the opinion held during the nineteenth century and in accordance with some later historians, M. Préclin maintains that the *Constitution Civile* was not the work of, and did not satisfy, the Jansenists. He points out that "the constitution rejects the cardinal idea of Richerism, constantly proclaimed throughout the whole century; namely, the right of the lower clergy to participate in the government of the Church through the synods". The Civil Constitution was accepted by some Richerists as a last resort and condemned by others, the "purest" of them. It is only in 1797, at the first national council, that the Richerist demands were adopted, but the triumph was ephemeral and Richerism fell into oblivion.

The book is a useful contribution to the history of Jansenism in the eighteenth century. It gives an interesting illustration of the affiliation of ideas and shows the "catalytic" power of a doctrine, not powerful enough to create, but strong enough to destroy.

Vassar College. MARIA TASTEVIN MILLER.

La Vie de Pierre Ruffin, Orientaliste et Diplomate, 1742–1824. Par Henri Dehérain, Conservateur de la Bibliothèque de l'Institut. [Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, tome XIII.] (Paris, Geuthner, 1929, pp. viii, 292, 250 fr.) M. Dehérain presents an excellent example of historical research, wherein by prolonged and extensive use of unpublished documents, diplomatic and private, he has reconstructed vividly and fully the career of one of France's representatives, who, while never reaching the first rank of importance, nevertheless rendered during almost the whole of a long life intelligent, industrious, and sustained service to his country. The bookmaker has supplemented the scholar's effort fitly, in a splendid volume embellished by a map and eight plates. The story is carried to the year 1804, leaving for a second volume the last twenty years of Ruffin's life, to which will be appended a bibliography for the whole work.

Ruffin was born to his vocation, since his father was for thirty-six years interpreter in the French consulate at Salonika. The son before ending his ninth year was admitted as king's scholar in Oriental languages at the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris. He was thus educated as a "tongue-youth" (jeune de langue) with intensive instruction in Latin, Turkish, Arabic, and Persian. At the age of sixteen he was sent to Constantinople for another eight years of study. In 1767 he became consul general in the Crimea. Having been captured on October 1, 1769, by the Russians, he remained a prisoner for nearly a year. After a return to

Paris, he served again at Constantinople from 1772 to 1774. Thereafter for twenty years he resided in Paris, accumulating the duties of secretary-interpreter of the king for Oriental languages, secretary for correspondence with the ports of the Levant, assistant in the king's library, and professor of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian in the College of France.

With the outbreak of the Revolution Ruffin kept his head both figuratively and literally, and was soon found useful by the new government. In 1794 he was sent once more to Constantinople as first secretary of the French legation, where he remained with some variations of title for twenty-nine years until his death. Profoundly and widely acquainted with Turkish literature and life, he enjoyed the long negotiations with the Turkish ministers, "where they wound around the subject discussed, like strands of vine around a tree, finesse, malice, historical digression, compliment, and salutation".

The book contains many interesting incidents which illustrate the diplomatic and governmental life of several decades. Numerous sketches are presented of persons associated with Ruffin, and many extracts are introduced from letters written by or to him or referring to him. The work as a whole constitutes almost a revelation of the qualities of adroitness, astuteness, politeness, readiness, and resourcefulness, which contributed decisively toward making the French diplomats of the great days superior to all others.

The University of Illinois. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

Die Schweiz im Spiegel Englischer und Amerikanischer Literatur bis 1848. Von Dr. Gustav Schirmer. Herausgegeben von der Stiftung von Schnyder von Wartensee. (Zurich and Leipzig, Orell Füssli Verlag, 1929, pp. xvi, 460, 12.80 M.) This is a work of forty years' intermittent compilation and deals with a period of twelve centuries from the foundation of the abbey of St. Gall to the establishment of the federal constitution. The excellent index reveals the names of more than four hundred and fifty English speaking persons who have written about Switzerland; consequently some of them receive only a few lines of comment and others more extended attention.

The work is divided into five periods the first of which covers nine centuries and is largely devoted to the British missionaries and pilgrims who came in contact with Switzerland. Later on, Richard Pace as agent of Henry VIII. greatly admired the military ability of the Swiss, and although he criticized their brutality, he bemoaned their high cost as mercenaries. His friend Thomas More would seem to have the same people in mind when he described the mercenary army of Utopia.

The period of the Reformation brought about a multitude of contacts between English and Swiss. The religious refugees at Zurich, Geneva, and Basel were unanimous in admiration and gratitude. From this time on to 1726 the wanderlust of the British carried them more and more into this mountainous region and the literature of travel increased in volume.

The writings of poets and scholars reflect the impressions of nature and mankind. A growing interest in majestic scenery is evident, quite different from the fear and superstition of an earlier age.

The "return to Nature" period in English literature was marked still more by increased interest in the spectacular scenery of Switzerland and sympathy with its institutions. The poets from James Thompson to Wordsworth responded to the inspiration of their travels. Adam Smith, Gibbon, Hume, Burke, and others had much to say about the liberty and customs of the country, while descriptive books of travel by persons of distinction multiplied. The poetic tendency rose to its height during the era of Romanticism, here placed between 1798 and 1832.

From 1832 to 1848 Switzerland was in a state of intermittent turmoil which brought its medieval political organization to its termination by the adoption of a federal constitution. These conditions invited the attention of English economists and historians, such as Ruskin and Carlyle, while Browning, Longfellow, and Tennyson found there themes for poetic efforts.

The book suffers somewhat from the repetition of impressions. The scenery of Switzerland has not visibly altered in the past twelve centuries and it grows a little monotonous to listen to raptures over the same topography. Unfavorable criticism of the people when it occurs is printed without restraint, but the great mass of evidence is favorable and often enthusiastic.

Pasadena, California. J. M. VINCENT.

The Church in France, 1789–1848: a Study in Revival. By C. S. Phillips, M.A., D.D., formerly Fellow and Lecturer of Selwyn College and Foundation Scholar of King's College, Cambridge. (Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Company, 1929, pp. viii, 315, $6.00.) The period under consideration in this volume is of much more than ordinary interest. It is the time during which the Catholic Church worked out in the French laboratory some of the principal theories and policies necessary for her adjustment to a world of tremendous social and political change. Perhaps the historian of the future will say that in 1929 the Church found herself comfortably in position. Certainly he will say that it was in the period 1789–1848 in France that she began to look for that position.

To those not familiar with the facts Dr. Phillips gives a survey that will be full of interest. Apparently an Anglo-Catholic, he takes a view sympathetic with the Catholic Church in her troubles, but not enthusiastic. His statements are usually well founded and there is just enough to be of interest to the general reader.

To anyone however who has already traversed this field in the company of other scholars this book will have very little to convey. One who has read the works of Weill or Goyau will find reproduced here neither the diligence of the one nor the brilliant suggestiveness of the other. Indeed the author falls short not only in comparison with these specialists

in the ecclesiastical field of Revolutionary history, but he writes of his special subject less clearly and sometimes less fully than authors like Mathiez and Madelin who have the whole field to consider. For example, in the chapter on the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, a subject of primary importance to a work like this, one will find almost nothing that is not given and better given in even a derivative book like Gottschalk's *Era of the French Revolution.* Again the usual biographical data are given apropos of the liberal school of French Catholics, Lamennais, Montalembert, and others. The usual statements are made about the opposition of the hierarchy. But no impression is given that the author is well acquainted biographically with any one of them. About the great liberals themselves there is little or no critical judgment. When the author tells us that our opinion of the religious sincerity of Chateaubriand must depend on the view we take of the personal character of Sainte-Beuve we can not help feeling that we are in contact with a not yet mature scholarship.

Washington, D. C. JOHN KEATING CARTWRIGHT.

Die Englisch-Belgischen Aufmarschpläne gegen Deutschland vor dem Weltkriege: eine Militärische Studie über die "Conventions Anglo-Belges" mit neuen Dokumenten. Von Carl Hosse. (Berlin, Amalthea Verlag, 1930, pp. 65.) When the German army invaded Belgium documents were found which could be and were used as a sort of *ex post facto* justification for the invasion. It was inevitable that they should bob up again during the present controversy over the war guilt question, especially since later revelations have thrown more light on the general question of Anglo-Belgian relations. Carl Hosse is able, for example, to bring into the picture the currently published *British Documents on the Origins of the War,* the memoirs of Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson, and other recent material. In the appendix he has included in French text and in German translation the chief known Anglo-Belgian military conventions, especially for the year 1906 (he admits that for the period from 1906 to 1914 the material is very scanty), and photographic reproductions of strategic maps.

So far the historical profession is well served. Unfortunately most of the book, and it is a very slim one at best, is taken up by furious assertion instead of calm analysis. The pages burst into a rash of italics at the slightest pretext. Reduced to a plain statement the argument is that Belgium was really in defensive alliance with France and England, that such an alliance is incompatible with the status of a neutralized state, that the alliance was political as well as military, and that England, France, and Belgium shared all their military plans and secrets as if they were parts of some political association closer even than an ordinary alliance. He says very pointedly that it would have been well for Germany to have had as close acquaintance with the military establishment of her own allies as the British had with their neutral neighbor's! It must be admitted in the face of these documents that all parts of this line of argu-

ment have much truth. But the author does not discuss what seems to most of us the really important question, whether Germany's plan of campaign against France, involving the necessary invasion of Belgium, well known to diplomats and military experts and even discussed by journalists before the agreements of 1906 were made, did not inevitably force Belgium to seek friends who would defend her in the hour of need. If so, Germany was, after all, the real author of the secret agreements by which Belgium became a minor partner of the Entente.

The University of Michigan. PRESTON SLOSSON.

Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Iceland in the World War. By Eli F. Heckscher, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, University College of Commerce, Stockholm, and Kurt Bergendal, Chief of Section, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Wilhelm Keilhau, Ph.D., University of Oslo; Einar Cohn, Chief of Bureau, Danish Department of Statistics, and Thorsteinn Thorsteinsson, Director of the Statistical Bureau of Iceland. [Economic and Social History of the World War, James T. Shotwell, General Editor.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930, pp. xvii, 593, $5.75.) Of the five volumes in the Scandinavian series of the monumental Economic and Social History of the World War the two Swedish volumes are the most impressive. It is therefore not surprising that in the present considerably abridged English volume, which deals with four different countries, about one half of the 587 pages have been accorded to two Swedish authorities.

Nobody in the Scandinavian North has contributed such a variety of stimulating studies in the field of economic history as Professor Heckscher. In the present volume he proceeds, after describing the essential qualities of the pre-war monetary systems in Sweden, to deal with the increase in the volume of note circulation, which, by the fact that much money was hoarded, did not have the expected result on the price level. In turning his attention to the lively discussion of the determinants of exchange rates, Professor Heckscher necessarily takes a stand with regard to the much debated doctrine of purchasing-power parity, which his compatriot, Professor Cassel, has systematically championed, though with increasing modifications, since 1916. Professor Heckscher shows that the relation between the price levels in Sweden and abroad is not sufficient to explain the movement of the exchanges. Among the subjects treated in his discussion, the question of the Swedish gold embargo is of particular value. But also the parts in which the Scandinavian monetary union is critically considered, as well as his explanation concerning discount policy, fully deserve the attention of specialists.

In the General Survey Professor Heckscher comes to the conclusion that "an outlook of moderate optimism is natural in Sweden, to a greater extent than in most European countries". Of all the neutral countries perhaps Norway was the most affected by the war. The German method was submarine war, the Allied method was the so-called blockade. The

longer the war lasted and the more drastic the commercial methods of the belligerents became, the stronger was their pressure directed against the non-combatants. The present volume should be read in connection with J. A. Salter's *Allied Shipping Control.*

Proper stress is laid by all contributors to this volume upon foreign relations, which explain the abnormal internal conditions in war time, but tedious repetitions in different parts of the book of the various enactments by the Allied and the Central Powers should have been avoided.

The translation has been well done. But why employ the term "Nordic" (pp. 298, 302), so often misused, when "northern" is meant?

Temple University. ANDREAS ELVIKEN.

Grandeur and Misery of Victory. By Georges Clemenceau. (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930, pp. 432, $5.00.) At first glance, Clemenceau's last testament seems of little value to the historian. It is partly a record of acrimonious disputes with Foch, Poincaré, Briand, etc., and partly a mixture of preposterous moralizing with savage snarling. It reveals no new facts and quotes little unpublished material. What can historians learn from it?

One way to look at the book is to take it seriously, to take it as a test of contemporary civilization. Here is the book of a man who should represent the best our times can produce. He was an experienced statesman, a student of arts and sciences, an atheist, in short, a super-civilized, "logical" Frenchman. His confessions should furnish the key to the vital forces of modern history.

Looking at it in this way—which is perhaps not fair, on account of the author's advanced age—what do we find? We find that the reason why he believed so passionately in the republican form of government was that his father was deported without a trial in 1858 by a monarchical government (p. 365). "My education was built upon ruthlessly hard-and-fast ideas crowned by a patriotism nothing could shake" (p. 364). "For the catastrophe of 1914 the Germans are responsible. Only a professional liar would deny this" (p. 105). American aid to embattled France was praiseworthy (p. 300), but America, grown "incredibly rich" in the war, deserted the cause of civilization in making a separate peace with the Huns (ch. XVI.). We learn that Louis XIV. and Napoleon were wicked to employ force (pp. 145, 158–159, 188) but that the fruits of their conquests, Alsace and Lorraine, were French to the core, as highly organized demonstrations in Strasbourg proved without a plebiscite (p. 189). In this book one searches in vain for a sign that the author realized the discrepancy between his principles and the alliance with Russia, or for a sign of repentance for the prolongation of the war or for the inhuman blockade after the war.

But Clemenceau was a very old man when he wrote this book. His ideas were at the mercy of his emotions, especially of his regrets. Probably he had held these ideas for many years, but in practice, at Versailles,

he did not act as if France were the only civilized country in Europe. To be sure, he did frame the treaty in such a way that France could later acquire the Saar and the Rhineland; in his last days he was disgusted that Poincaré and Briand had not taken advantage of the opportunities he created. He forgot that then, as in 1919, France was not strong enough to disregard the rest of Europe. Perhaps the very violence of Foch's posthumous attack will explain much of this.

The best comment on the book is the statement (p. 188), in the rather awkward language of the translation, "that there is nothing conquerors are more in haste to do than to set down to the account of a sham and invented equity those violent deeds they arrogate to themselves the privilege of committing".

The University of Missouri. M. H. COCHRAN.

The Rise of South Africa. By Sir George E. Cory, D.Litt. Volume V. (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1930, pp. xiv, 520, $10.00.) The fifth of Sir George Cory's projected six volumes on *The Rise of South Africa* from the earliest times to 1857 covers the years between 1847 and 1854. It was a period marked by striking and significant events. The anti-convict agitation was vehement enough to force the secretary of state for the colonies to abandon his transportation policy as regards South Africa. In 1854 self-government was established in the colony; also the agitation for a separate system in the East—in many respects justifiable—was in full swing. Other happenings of moment were the Sand River Convention by which, in 1852, the South African Republic in the Transvaal secured recognition and its first twenty-five years of continuous independence; furthermore, the Orange River Sovereignty was annexed in 1848 only to be released as the Orange River Free State six years later. Then, between 1850 and 1853, South Africa had to face the most formidable Kaffir war with which it had yet been plagued, while to make matters worse a Hottentot rising broke out as well.

While the author treats adequately the political and constitutional he still reserves considerable space for small frontier incidents and for negotiations and conflicts with the natives, though he has striven conscientiously to select and condense. Moreover, the reader must admit that much of this detail is necessary to convey to him a vivid realization of the hardships and dangers to which the settlers were exposed. The presentation is essentially impartial and the careful weighing of evidence inspires confidence. Sir George has taken infinite pains not only in the study of extant correspondence, government archives, and relevant monographs but also by long and frequent travels for the purpose of interviewing surviving ancients. As a result the determined attitude of the colonists on such vital issues as the anti-convict agitation and the problem of shaping the constitution are well brought out; and the various grievances of the Easterners and the Boers are discussed with understanding. In spite of the fact that Earl Grey apparently failed to appreciate fully the

difficulties of Sir Harry Smith, thus enabling Sir George Cathcart, in a large measure, to reap the fruits of the labors of a lovable and valiant if histrionic figure, nevertheless the author's extracts from the famous colonial secretary's dispatches indicate both conscientiousness and sagacity. The Stockenstrom-Fairburn mission receives all the consideration to which it is entitled, while the scathing treatment of Stockenstrom appears to be amply deserved. The samples of Hottentot oratory (pp. 191, 192) are intensely amusing. There are various illustrations, in addition to maps and plans, while a satisfactory index is supplemented by an unusually full table of contents.

The University of Michigan. ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

New Zealand in the Making: a Survey of Economic and Social Developments. By J. B. Condliffe, D.Sc., Research Secretary, Institute of Pacific Relations. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930, pp. 524, $5.00.) Dr. Condliffe, in a most stimulating fashion, sketches a composite picture of the economic and social developments which have been and continue to be making New Zealand. His effort consists of much more than a mere chronicle of events or a restatement of familiar information, for, from the nature of the material covered, the work naturally expands into a critical historical summary of the major problems confronted by New Zealand. In the analysis and interpretation of general movements, neither constitutional nor political developments are treated as more than incidental to the central theme of social and economic phenomena. Thus the author ably presents a conspectus of New Zealand's economic experiments, social problems and legislation, public finance (notably tariff, taxation, and banking), land problems and policies, labor movements, judicial settlement of industrial disputes, trade and commerce, educational practices, and natural resources. To this must be added certain anthropological data cited in connection with early British imperialism in the Dominion. In the detailed account of each problem, outstanding facts are carefully accentuated so that their interrelation appears perfectly clear. Although secondary sources are utilized admirably, greater merit lies in the use of statutes accurately digested, instructive statistics, and the results of the author's own historical research. Throughout the volume, meticulous selection of pertinent details enhances rather than detracts from the general effectiveness.

Writers generally agree that "the whole history of New Zealand has been shaped by its isolation, its forests and its mountains". It is doubtful whether a better illustration of precisely how these factors have carved New Zealand's unique history has yet appeared. Furthermore, encomium falls upon the fresh interpretation of New Zealand's legislative experiments, wherein Dr. Condliffe contends that empirical opportunism rather than doctrinaire theory has been the dominating factor. The author describes New Zealand's state socialism in terms of "étatism", "colonial governmentalism", rather than state socialism as commonly

understood; he considers it an essential widening of state functions. Perhaps the pragmatic view of state socialism as due primarily to colonial opportunism and freedom from theories may meet with dissenting opinion in some quarters. Nevertheless, the concise delimitation of New Zealand's chief extensions in the sphere of public enterprise allays any fundamental criticism of the author's thesis.

By incorporating a more exhaustive index and an alphabetical bibliography in the present appendix now containing valuable chapter by chapter documentation, the usefulness of the volume might have been increased.

The Brookings Institution. KENNETH O. WARNER.

Indian Islam: a Religious History of Islam in India. By Murray T. Titus, Ph.D., D.D. [The Religious Quest of India series, edited by E. C. Dewick, M.A., Literary Secretary, National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations, India, Burma, and Ceylon, and Murray T. Titus, Missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. xvi, 290, $4.50.) It seems strange that we should have had to wait until now for a "religious history of Islam in India"; but I believe it is true that nowhere else will this entire subject be found treated in a single work. Neither theology nor ethnology is included in the author's plan; either would have made the field too large, and the former at any rate has been treated in general works on Mohammedanism. Political history is, of course, equally excluded. Mr. Titus aims to tell "how [Islam] came, how it spread, how it divided and subdivided, how it has been affected by its [Hindu] environment, and how it has reacted to modern conditions".

This purpose has been carried out with conspicuous success. The book is competent and readable. If the historical part is based chiefly on secondary sources, these are at least well chosen and judiciously handled; and as to the present and immediate past, the author has been able to draw on extensive personal knowledge, to the great enrichment of his work. His attitude is fair and objective, even sympathetic on the whole. He deals first with the religious aspects of the Moslem conquest, and with the various methods of conversion, at first largely forceful, although even from the start, and increasingly as time went on, more peaceful means were employed. The violence of Moslem propaganda has doubtless been greatly exaggerated. For centuries, at least, it has played no important rôle, and the desire to escape from social oppression has undoubtedly drawn most Indian converts to Islam, as to Christianity. We then come to the organization of the orthodox (Sunnī) community; the heterodox Shī'ahs and Mahdawīs and other sects; the numerous religious orders, "regular" and "irregular", and popular saint-worship; the influence of Hinduism; and finally, in two very interesting chapters, contemporary movements and "the new Muslim apologetic and polemic". The conclusion is reached that "in spite of all the weakness that division

and communalism breed . . . Islam in India to-day is better organized, better educated, more progressive, more reasonable and tolerant in its attitude towards its neighbors than ever before in its history".

The value of the book is increased by a long appendix containing useful tabulations of many historic and contemporary data, a full bibliography, a glossary of Islamic terms, and an index.

Yale University. FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Christians in China before the Year 1500. By A. C. Moule. (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930, pp. xvi, 293, 15 s.) The subject of the early presence of Christianity in China has had great fascination for Western students of that country. It is not strange that this has been so. Until the close of the fifteenth century, China was the region most distant from its original source to which Christianity had spread. Christianity was represented continuously either in China proper or on the borders of the empire from at least the seventh century until the fourteenth and possibly until the sixteenth century. Yet, so far as we now know, out of these seven to nine hundred years of contact no permanent impression of any importance was made on Chinese life.

Few men are as well qualified as is Mr. Moule to write the history of Christianity in China during these centuries. He has long been a careful student of the subject, has published on it a number of valuable articles, and has examined most of the pertinent documents of whose existence scholars are aware. This present volume is not so much a narrative as a source book. In it has been brought together and given in English translation the larger part of the material which is now known. As an introduction Mr. Moule gives the reports which the Jesuits of the sixteenth century heard of the last survivors of earlier Christian communities. He next examines the traditions which ascribe the planting of Christianity in China to the Apostle Thomas, and rightly judges them to be late and untrustworthy. Then, beginning with the famous Nestorian monument, which gives an account of the coming of Christianity to China in A.D. 635 and of its career through much of the T'ang dynasty, he gives, roughly in chronological order, the pertinent documents down through the Chinese official history of the Mongol dynasty (the *Yüan Shih*) and the European writers of the fourteenth century. Extensive comments, both in the text and in footnotes, serve to throw light on the documents and to put the reader in touch with most of what has been written on the subject by scholars in the past three hundred years.

Experts will find little that is new. They will, however, be grateful for a fresh translation of the text of the Nestorian monument, for the convenience of having most of the available material between the covers of one volume, and for the extensive footnotes. They will wish that the original texts, particularly those in Chinese, could have been printed along with the translation, and that at least the Chinese characters for proper names could have been given. To the non-expert the volume will prove an invaluable compendium of the entire subject.

Yale University. K. S. LATOURETTE.

The Old China Trade. By Foster Rhea Dulles. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930, pp. 228, $4.00.) In this book Mr. Dulles has told the story of the old China trade from the voyage of the *Empress of China* in 1784 to the Treaty of Wanghia in 1844. It is indeed a salutary thing to watch the growing interest of historical students in a subject which had formerly been largely ignored. Unfortunately Mr. Dulles's work bears little testimony either to thorough investigation or to a brilliant pen that would have served his purpose—to recapture the spirit of adventure and daring. One closes the book with the impression that it is not a well-ordered chronicle.

The events of more than half a century have been told within the short space of two hundred pages, and, what is worse, these pages are burdened with tiresome anecdotes. A more intelligent handling of the subject would condense or eliminate the latter and make greater room for the discussion of the more important matters. For instance, the adventures of early East India merchants should be dealt with at greater length, for it was they who initiated the China trade. We know that by 1800 there were in Philadelphia many firms like Samuel Archer and Company and Jones and Clark that built their fortunes through trading with Canton. After the War of 1812 such renowned firms flourished in New York as Talbott, Olyphant and Company, Thomas H. Smith and Sons, and Hoyt and Tom. In the mid-'thirties the contents of the trade were enlarged; F. and N. G. Carnes, for example, ordered a great many fancy articles from China made after Parisian samples at one-tenth of the cost. One would like to know more of these facts which Mr. Dulles has slightly touched or wholly ignored than of the dispatching of ships or consuls which has received lengthy treatment.

The source materials used are not extensive. Many valuable manuscripts, such as the customs house records of old towns, consular letters, and documents in the Library of Congress, and missionary records in the Harvard Theological School, would have been consulted with benefit. Nor is the work free from errors. The invoice of the *Grand Turk* (p. 43) is wrong, having misrepresented 163 ½bbls. as 163½ bbls., 123 ½Bbls. as 123½ Bbls., 20 ½Hogshds as 20½ Hogshds, and dropped two items toward the end (*cf.* Robert E. Peabody, *The Log of the Grand Turks,* pp. 63–64). One of the terms of the Treaty of Nanking provided for the opening of five ports; it is ambiguous to write "four additional ports" (pp. 168, 172, 184).

Finally it may be noted that in accounting for the significance of the China trade, Mr. Dulles gropes only among political issues. The fact that the trade had the effect of bringing the Americans into contact with Chinese culture has not been thought of and has not been commented upon.

Cambridge. PING-CHIA KUO.

Social Sciences in the Balkans and in Turkey: a Survey of Resources for Study and Research in these Fields of Knowledge. By Robert Joseph

Kerner, Professor of Modern European History, University of California. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1930, pp. 137, $1.75.) The pages of the volume are nicely proportioned between Jugoslavia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey, with a brief introduction and still briefer conclusions. Written with pithy conciseness, the amount of information packed into these few pages is remarkable. It is all the more welcome because of the paucity and the too frequently untrustworthy character of such material heretofore available. Included are geography, anthropology, ethnology, history, political science, sociology, and psychology. Of these, in general, history and political science seem to be strongest, psychology weakest, relatively speaking. Under each country the general plan of social science teaching is first sketched briefly, then follows the background and foundation of university work, the arrangement of the social sciences in the universities, the relation of law and the social sciences, the professors in each subject and their principal publications, the standards of scholarship observed, the library material available, the publications of the universities, the learned societies and their output, the financial support for the teaching and for book supply, and general remarks upon the research in each particular country. Not the least valuable are the pages devoted to the lists of periodicals in the social sciences published in the different countries and to the publications of the universities and of the learned academies. Through these societies and the subsidized reviews publication is made possible, the cost of publishing privately being nearly prohibitive. The serious handicaps of the social sciences are inadequate funds and lack of a ripened sense of coöperation among the professors in the various subjects. Something like a national research council is suggested for each of the Balkan states. Professor Kerner's criticisms are friendly and wholesome.

Cambridge. ARTHUR I. ANDREWS.

De Soto and the Conquistadores. By Theodore Maynard. (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1930, pp. xiii, 297, $3.50.) This book follows the career of Hernando de Soto from his arrival in America in 1519 to his death in 1542. It covers his activities in Central America, as protégé of Pedrarias, the energetic part he played in the conquest of Peru, and his chief labor, the exploration of Florida resulting in the discovery of the Mississippi River. The author shows clearly that De Soto, as commander of scouting expeditions and leader of advance guards, was truly the "spear head" of Pizarro's invasion of Peru. But the author presents so much background and so much matter on other *conquistadores* as to prevent the formation of a clear picture of De Soto at the Peruvian stage of his career. In the portion of the narrative treating of De Soto's activities in Florida, however, the reader is given a vivid view of him. Here also more light is available from the records, and 150 pages of the volume are devoted to De Soto's last adventurous enterprise. It is presented in somewhat less detail than is found in Grace King's *De Soto and his Men in the Land of Florida.*

Mr. Maynard based his work on the leading original sources for the subject and frequently cites them in the text. His volume is well written and gives a readable, fairly comprehensive story of the adventures of De Soto and the *conquistadores* associated with him; but it shows a bias in favor of the Spaniards and against the aborigines. The chroniclers of the conquest presented the side of the white man. There was need therefore of scientific imagination on the part of the author to enable him to see the struggle from the standpoint of the American natives in order that the record might be as true as possible.. The present reviewer regards as generally inexcusable the Spaniard's barbarous cruelty to the Indians, which the author tends to defend. Likewise, the reviewer feels that Mr. Maynard overemphasizes missionary zeal as a factor in the Spanish conquest—though it played an important part—and ignores too much the driving power of the Spaniard's greed for material gain. She also disagrees with the author's statement that "The sole signal advantage of the *Conquistadores* [over the aborigines] lay in their possession of horses". Though the fact of having mounted soldiers unquestionably gave the Spaniards a decidedly superior position, their possession of cannon and small arms was an advantage at least equally conspicuous.

The book is supplied with a bibliography and a satisfactory index and is illustrated with a number of interesting reprints from old maps and pictures.

Goucher College. MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS.

Church and State in Massachusetts from 1740 to 1833: a Chapter in the History of the Development of Individual Freedom. By Jacob C. Meyer, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Western Reserve University. (Cleveland, Western Reserve University Press, 1930, pp. viii, 276, $1.50.) When disestablishment of religion has once taken place, there has rarely been any effective effort to restore the previous status quo, while soon an air of unreality hovers over the past condition, which comes to be viewed as a hazy, theoretical (*condescendingly*, perchance unfortunate) situation, instead of the historical actuality which at least some of its own contemporaries found it to be. After three or more generations have lived under the presuppositions of separation of church and state, nothing but a truly historical study of the earlier régime will make those of the later time understand that it was truly 'a condition—not a theory' which confronted the 'dissenters' in Massachusetts up to 1833.

Those who have labored through the invaluable work of Backus will appreciate the orderly arrangement of the materials in Professor Meyer's treatise as well as its extension until complete separation had become an actuality. Isaac Backus did not live to see that day. While the long movement was no one-man affair, his part in it, while not ignored, might have been more explicitly explained and evaluated, for no one, more clearly than he, both saw and declared that establishment was the visible denial of full religious liberty.

The orderliness of this book is emphasized by the summarizing paragraphs at the end of each chapter. A comprehensive, well-classified bibliography will suggest more detailed study of many phases of the main subject and may lead some into the broader realms of religious freedom for further investigation. The unusually intelligible index shows how close the central theme is to many aspects of New England's religious life.

The Library of Congress. WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

Bits of Cambridge History. By Samuel Francis Batchelder. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1930, pp. 349, $4.00.) It is a fortunate local antiquary whose *locus* yields him such material as the late Samuel F. Batchelder could find by looking beneath the surface of things in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Three years before his death in 1927 he published a volume, *Bits of Harvard History,* assembling a series of interesting papers on various aspects of the past at Harvard. This new volume, a posthumous production, does the same thing for the community surrounding what used to be known as "the colleges".

The four papers that make up the book have to do with the Revolutionary period, and only one of them—a careful study and a virtual rejection of the tradition that Washington took command of his army under the "Washington Elm"—deals with the "patriots'" side of the record. The first and longest section of the book is devoted to Burgoyne and his Officers in Cambridge, 1777–1778. The large contingent of British and Hessian soldiers who, under the terms of their surrender at Saratoga, had to be cared for in and near Cambridge until they could be transported to England, raised serious questions for the little town, and the proper entertainment of the officers in a place which was no longer a happy hunting ground for Loyalists gave rise to infinite complications. By a thorough search of local and other records Mr. Batchelder has brought together a mass of significant and picturesque information, both military and social. In the second category must be placed the contemporaneous evidence to the effect that the "idle and dissipated army . . . corrupted the students of Harvard College, and the youth of the capital and its environs, who were allured into their gambling parties and other scenes of licentiousness". In the name of Riedesel Avenue in Cambridge the more savory tradition of the Baron Riedesel and his wife has a compensating survival.

The second extensive paper in the book deals with Colonel Henry Vassall, and presents an excellent picture of this pre-Revolutionary figure and his family, and also of the whole local society of Tories in which they held an important place. Another paper, the Adventures of John Nutting, Cambridge Loyalist, sketches the highly varied career of one for whom Cambridge was a mere starting point for activities in many quarters on both sides of the Atlantic. The rescue from an oblivion into which Nutting might otherwise have fallen quite justifies itself.

This indeed may be said of much that the book contains. The narrative is relieved by touches of a generally judicious levity, probably

introduced for the benefit of the Cambridge Historical Society before which some of the papers were read; but before printing them Mr. Batchelder saw to the careful annotation which is bound to enhance their usefulness to other scholars in his field. It is to be regretted that the publishers, lacking an index of the author's own provision, have not themselves provided one.

Boston. M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

Houdon in America: a Collection of Documents in the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress. Edited by Gilbert Chinard, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, with an Introduction by Francis Henry Taylor, Curator in the Pennsylvania Museum of Art and of the Rodin Museum, Philadelphia. [Historical Documents, Institut Français de Washington, cahier iv.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1930, pp. xxvi, 51, $3.50.) This little volume is perhaps more properly to be considered as a gesture than as a contribution to history, for though the bulk of it consists of extracts from the papers of Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Monroe, and their contemporaries, there is nothing included that is not already well known and little that has not been previously published in works on the sculptor Houdon.

But, as a gesture by the Institut Français de Washington "to promote in the United States of America the study of French civilization and history, literature and art", it is all that it should be. The source material is full enough and intimate enough to give a vivid picture of the visit of the great French artist to the new republic—then in the first flush of consciousness of its place in the world of civilization—and of the later trials of the artist in the cataclysm of the French Revolution. There are beside, many amusing sidelights on the characters in the story, Jefferson's canny insistence that Houdon's life be well insured before this country risked him on the sea, Washington's patience and courtesy under the ordeal of being a national idol, John Paul Jones's ingenuous vanity and complete lack of attention to business detail, and the ostracism of Condorcet from the circle of his most intimate Parisian friends.

Needless to say the book is charmingly gotten up, paper, typography, and binding all excellent, and the photogravures of Houdon's portrait by Rembrandt Peale and of a selection of busts by the great master—Washington, Franklin, La Fayette, Jefferson, Joel Barlow, Fulton, Condorcet, and John Paul Jones—enough in themselves to make the publication a delight.

Exception may perhaps be taken to a tendency to repetition in the forewords. The introduction, by Francis Henry Taylor, reprinted from the Pennsylvania Museum *Bulletin* of 1928, gives a brief account of Houdon's life and relates his visit to America, with a few extracts from the original documents which deal with it. Then comes a short foreword by Gilbert Chinard telling again of Houdon's visit to America with further excerpts from the sources, and then follows the real meat of the work, the docu-

mentary sources themselves. Perhaps the latter need some commentary to make the thread of the story clear, but it must be confessed that, after the preliminaries, the notes of Jefferson and Washington have lost a little of their freshness. One is conscious of a thricetold tale.

But after all, so charming a gesture should not be criticized; its purpose is to please, and in that it eminently succeeds.

The Library of Congress. LEICESTER B. HOLLAND.

Russo-American Relations, 1815–1867. By Benjamin Platt Thomas, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Birmingham-Southern College. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, series XLVIII., no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1930, pp. 185, $1.75.) Professor Thomas presents a condensed outline of the diplomatic relations between the United States and Russia in the first half of the nineteenth century concerning both the local Pacific problems and the "Grosse Politik" problems. The sources of his information are chiefly the documents of the State Department archives; documents of the Russian archives are quoted either from photostats in the Library of Congress, or from excerpts published by the late Frank Alfred Golder in his valuable articles on the problem of Russo-American relations. As regards general information and secondary works, it should be noted that Professor Thomas does not make any use at all of Russian literature. While the author studies the documents of the diplomatic correspondence proper, it appears that the background of Russian public opinion has been entirely left aside. This may lead to some distortions in the author's conclusions.

Professor Thomas is of the opinion that "Russia's attitude (towards the United States) . . . was wholly selfish" (p. 170), that "the policy of Russia was dictated solely by self-interest" (p. 127). Of course, motives of self-interest usually play an important rôle in the relations of every country towards another one. However, in order to avoid simplified deductions, it is necessary to investigate whether some idealistic motives were, or were not, combined with the national egoistic interests. In the case of Russia's attitude towards the United States during the Civil War, it is hard to deny that such idealistic motives were present in Russian public opinion, which, in this case, backed official diplomacy. As serfdom had been abolished by Russia herself just before the outbreak of the American Civil War, and as other liberal reforms were going on in Russia, the majority of the Russian public was full of warm feelings towards the cause of Abraham Lincoln.

It should be noted in this connection that, while dealing with the dispatch of Russian squadrons to the United States in 1863, Professor Thomas quotes the instructions issued by the acting secretary of the Russian navy to the commander of one of the Russian squadrons, Rear Admiral Lesovsky, according to Golder's excerpt in the *American Historical Review*, volume XX. However, this is not a translation of the document, but rather a summary of it. The Russian document in full has recently

been published by Mr. Adamov in volume XXXVIII. of the *Krasnyi Arkhiv* (1930). On the whole, however, Professor Thomas's book gives a great deal of information and is a useful contribution to the problem.

Yale University. G. VERNADSKY.

Californian Indian Nights Entertainments. Compiled by Edward W. Gifford, Curator of the Museum of Anthropology in the University of California, and Gwendoline Harris Block, Assistant in Anthropology in the University of California. (Glendale, Arthur H. Clark Company, 1930, pp. 323.)[1] This is a most laudable attempt to make available to the general laity a representative collection of Californian Indian myths and tales. The collection itself is based upon the records of anthropologists in the University of California *Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*, the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, and the publications of the American Museum of Natural History. The accompanying illustrations are most excellent and to the point. A map is given showing the distribution of the linguistic stocks and tribes. It goes without saying that the authors follow the rather extreme position of Kroeber and Sapir, but no real damage is done as we are explicitly told in the introduction that these classifications are not universally accepted. The only adverse criticism that perhaps may be made is this: it would have been well to designate in every case the exact source as well as general provenience of the myth and tale (compare, for example, this feature in Stith Thompson's *Tales of North American Indians*, although the elaborate comparative notes naturally would be out of place in the present volume).

Bureau of American Ethnology. TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Adair's History of the Indians. Edited under the auspices of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in Tennessee by Samuel Cole Williams, LL.D. (Johnson City, the Watauga Press, 1930. pp. xxxviii, 508.) *Washakie: an Account of Indian Resistance of the Covered Wagon and Union Pacific Railroad Invasions of the Territory.* By Grace Raymond Hebard, Professor of Political Economy and Sociology, University of Wyoming. (Glendale, Arthur H. Clark Company, 1930, pp. 337, $6.00.) James Adair's history of the American Indians, published in London in 1775, is one of our most important sources of information in regard to the Southern Indians in the eighteenth century. Between 1735 and 1768 he was almost constantly among them as a trader and as a representative of the government of South Carolina, and he had an unrivaled opportunity for becoming thoroughly acquainted with their character and customs, and with the complicated history of the intertribal wars and alliances of that period. A man of education, and of some literary attainments, his scientific interest in the Indians and his desire to influence the policy of the English government, impelled him to write his *History*. To the modern student it is an irritat-

[1] Printed with permission of the Smithsonian Institution.

ing book. Valuable as it is, it seems sometimes to omit the very things which we would wish to know, but which he did not think worthy to be recorded, and his thesis of Indian descent from the Ten Lost Tribes, which he supports by the most ingenious philological and ethnological arguments, frequently causes us to suspect the accuracy of his observations.

The original edition is no longer accessible to the average student. It has become exceedingly rare, and copies have recently sold for one hundred dollars. Mr. Williams's new edition is most welcome. It is critically edited with an introduction, which presents much new material in regard to the life of the author, explanatory notes and an index. It is to be regretted that the introduction is so exclusively biographical. A brief, but comprehensive account of the intricate and shifting relations of the tribes with each other, and with the English, French, and Spanish who were using them as pawns in the game of political and economic expansion, would have made the book more intelligible to the reader who is not a specialist in a rather obscure phase of colonial history.

Adair's *History*, in spite of its title, is in reality the history of the tribes between the Carolinas and the Mississippi during a comparatively short period; Miss Hebard's book is frankly an account of a minor aspect of Indian history. It tells the story of the contact between white man and Indian in western Wyoming in the nineteenth century. It is almost a biography of Washakie, the outstanding figure among the Indians of Wyoming. Born in 1798, before a white man had set foot in the region, he lived until 1900, and during sixty years of that time, he was the active and undisputed chief of the Eastern Shoshones. Always a friend to the white man and loyal to the government, his authority and influence were of vital importance in opening the country and in the transformation of his people from wandering hunters to settled agriculturalists. Miss Hebard has assembled a great deal of interesting and valuable material from the correspondence and memoirs of the fur traders, missionaries, army officers, and pioneers, who were instrumental in opening the region to white settlement. The book is illustrated with twenty-four photographs and five maps.

Washington, D. C. JOSEPH C. GREEN.

Stagecoach and Tavern Tales of the Old Northwest. By Harry Ellsworth Cole, late President of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Edited by Louise Phelps Kellogg. (Glendale, Arthur H. Clark Company, 1930, pp. 376, $6.00.) The convivial, rustic flavor of the frontier abounds in this volume. The tales told and the pictures drawn revive the atmosphere of the settlement border in the middle nineteenth century. Mr. Cole became enamored of the lore and glamour of the days of frontier taverns and through years of eager searching and collecting assembled a wealth of information and anecdote about taverns and stagecoaches and the pioneer life that clustered about them. These stories and

pictures are most interesting in this day when automobile boulevards retrace the old stagecoach routes, and in a time when the stagecoaches are gone and there remain only a few ghost-like shells of wayside taverns.

The first, but minor, part of the book deals with the stagecoach and with pioneer roads. The treatment here is general and far from exhaustive. It is the tavern that was apparently the author's first love. The tales that cling about these primitive hostelries form the great bulk and chief interest of the volume.

There is a good description of the typical "raising" of early log taverns, and of the rustic furnishings they housed and the primitive entertainment provided. As the first log structures gave way to more impressive buildings of frame, stone, or brick, the tavern became the community center. It often served as courthouse, post office, and polling place, and frequently became the schoolhouse and church. Picturesque features of the life of the countryside are well depicted, with accounts of freight wagons lumbering over heavy roads, itinerant horse traders and peddlers bartering and selling, and land speculators and bandits plying their respective trades.

A roll is given of famous taverners of Wisconsin, with anecdotes concerning them and their most distinguished guests. Numerous stories portray the accommodations in these early hotels—the beds, the food, the cheery open fire, the obligation upon the taverner to care for all guests, no matter how great their number or how limited his space. The title of the book is misleading, for the work is devoted almost exclusively to Wisconsin.

The volume is enlivened with thirty-one illustrations, most of which are of notable frontier taverns. Two maps are included. One shows some of the stagecoach routes of the old Northwest; the other gives locations of early taverns and stagecoach routes in the region between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River. The volume carries no footnotes or bibliography but is provided with an adequate index. The general format is excellent.

The State Museum, Denver. LEROY R. HAFEN.

A Quaker Forty-Niner: the Adventures of Charles Edward Pancoast on the American Frontier. Edited by Anna Paschall Hannum, with a Foreword by John Bach McMaster. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930, pp. xv, 402, $3.50.) The listed published journals of the overland emigrants to California in the gold rush days are, for the most part, of those emigrants who followed the central or northern routes to the Pacific Coast; and we have heard too little of the trials and sufferings of the overlanders who struggled through the deserts and mountains of the far Southwest. It is refreshing, therefore, to come upon such a vivid record as that of Charles Edward Pancoast (1818–1906), who describes his journey from Missouri to the California mines in 1849–1850 by the southern route. His journal is perhaps the more interesting

because it is not in the set form of a diary, but flows on in an easy, rambling manner. As the writer himself says he kept no systematic record of his life, and we are forced to take his reminiscences as they stand.

Pancoast's narrative is not merely that of an overland traveler, nor that of an unlucky California miner. Nearly one half of the volume is devoted to his boyhood in New Jersey, his youth in Philadelphia, and his young manhood in Missouri. The story of his misadventures and failures in the Missouri backwoods supplies excellent pictures of the middle frontier. Here and there familiar characters, such as "Mormon Joe" Smith and Abraham Lincoln, stand out from a somewhat wearisome confusion of petty characters.

The caravan in which Pancoast made his journey across the plains and deserts to southern California left Fort Leavenworth late in April, 1849. Again interesting characters appear, such as Kit Carson and that mysterious and rather sinister Indian fighter, James Kirker, who had earned an unsavory reputation on both sides of the Mexican border. The route of Pancoast's party was substantially over the Santa Fé Trail and down the Rio Grande and into Chihuahua and Sonora. Coming into Arizona past the old ruins of San Bernardino mission, they reached the Gila and followed its course down to Yuma, where Pancoast makes some interesting comments on the conduct of the United States Army officers stationed there. After many splits and reunions of the caravan, Pancoast's remnant of it reached the Mariposa mines in February of 1850.

Life in California proved no less disappointing to the Quaker than had been his sojourn in Missouri. Successive failures as miner, storekeeper, rancher, and druggist's clerk finally discouraged him, and he made his way back to Philadelphia in 1854 by way of Nicaragua, to spend the rest of his life in that city.

The illustrations and maps have been well designed and chosen to match the form of the narrative, and as a whole add much color to it. The editorial footnotes might profitably be more numerous in dealing with local Missouri. In attempting to correct Pancoast's version of William Walker's career (p. 374), the editor has fallen into a minor error by saying that Walker "was seized and executed in Nicaragua in 1860".

Arizona State Teachers College. RUFUS KAY WYLLYS.

The Papers of Randolph Abbott Shotwell. Edited by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton with the collaboration of Rebecca Cameron. Volume I. (Raleigh, North Carolina Historical Commission, 1929, pp. xxvi, 511.) This is the first volume of a work by Randolph A. Shotwell, which he called *Three Years in Battle and Three in Federal Prisons.* Born a Virginian in 1844, he became identified with North Carolina after the Civil War and remained so until his death in 1885. When the war broke out he was in school in Pennsylvania. Being intensely Southern in his feel-

ings, he quit school, and with two dollars in his pocket set out to cross the frontier into the Confederacy, determined to join the first regiment he should meet. Fighting first at Ball's Bluff, he became an active participant in the principal battles in Virginia down to the time of his capture just before the engagement at Cold Harbor in 1864. This volume is concerned with his war-time experiences and observations, as far as the Battle of Gettysburg. Shotwell had very distinct likes and dislikes and he was never slow in giving his views on the questions of the times. He believed the Confederacy lost a great opportunity to win independence when it failed to adopt a bold aggressive policy following the Battle of Bull Run. He would have carried the war into the North, and by developing early a vast cavalry force he believed the Confederacy could easily have forced an early peace. Though a patriotic soldier, and so through choice, he complained much and bitterly at the hard lot of the private, made so by the utter inefficiency of the civil government. Naturally, then, he would have no great respect for President Davis. All along, he believed that if the war should be lost, it would be due to the breakdown of the morale of the soldiers, brought about unnecessarily by red tape and neglect both civil and military. In his realistic descriptions of the corpse-strewn battlefields and the terrors of clumsy amputations in hospitals, he has not been excelled by the weird stories of Ambrose Bierce.

Shotwell wrote his account a decade after the war, with the exception of portions of a diary, which he interspersed through his narrative. Although most of the work was autobiographical, considerable portions dealt with things about which Shotwell had no personal knowledge. The editor has omitted the latter. The chief value of this work rests in the vivid picture it gives of the thoughts and actions of a common soldier. With all its lurid details, it takes the romance out of war, and clothes it in a horrid garb. In his zest for effect in his writing, Shotwell at times has embellished the tale of his personal experiences slightly beyond the facts. No great amount of editing was necessary, but whatever need there was has been admirably met by Dr. Hamilton.

The University of Georgia. E. M. COULTER.

Civil War Prisons: a Study in War Psychology. By William Best Hesseltine, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of Chattanooga. (Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1930, pp. xi, 290, $3.00.) Until Dr. Hesseltine's book there has been no unbiased effort to get at the truth on the subject of Civil War prisons. But now we have an exhaustive, impartial, and critical study. Unfortunately the discussion of the bungling Confederate prison administration is not brought together in a single chapter with such incidental reference to it in other chapters as would have been required to give unity and clarity to the narrative. The result is the lack of a clear-cut picture of Confederate failure, which was due not only to the lack of any intelligent and considered plan, to faulty and often inept administration, to haphazard selection of sites and construction

of prisons, but also to the poverty of the South, shortage of food, clothing, medicines, etc. Certainly the threadbare accusations of deliberate cruelty can no longer be advanced in explanation of the horrors of Andersonville, Libby, and elsewhere. The Northern prison administration was far from being perfect.

Dr. Hesseltine has based his study on the eight volumes of the second series of the *Official Records,* supplemented by other miscellaneous public documents and the large volume of post-bellum memoirs that became more bitter and imaginative as the period of the experiences recorded receded into the past. A substantial bibliography covers the subject from the polemical viewpoint. The *Official Records* are not listed, though they are cited frequently, nor have the pertinent passages in the histories of Rhodes and Channing, *House Report* number 45, 40th Congress, 3d session, on The Treatment of Prisoners, or the Trial of Henry Wirz in *House Executive Document* number 1, 39th Congress, 1st session, been included. It is not apparent whether the footnote citations to Wirz's trial are to the last named document or to an anonymous polemic published in 1865. The seven volumes of the *Journals of the Confederate Congress* are not mentioned or cited. Jones, *Confederate View of the Treatment of Prisoners,* should be identified as a reprint from Southern Historical Society *Papers,* volume I., pages 113–327.

Great Neck, New York. THOMAS ROBSON HAY.

Rutherford B. Hayes, Statesman of Reunion. By H. J. Eckenrode, assisted by Pocahontas Wilson Wight. (New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1930, pp. xii, 363, $5.00.) In 1917 Professor Van Tyne in a review of Dr. Eckenrode's *The Revolution in Virginia* (*A. H. R.,* XXII. 395) wrote that "the work is rich in new suggestions, courageous conclusions, and significant contributions to the larger currents of our national history". That appraisal would apply equally well to the life of Rutherford B. Hayes. The central theme is the view that President Hayes, though elected as the result of fraudulent manipulations, was able to effect a reunion of North and South and that Tilden, if he had been allowed to take the place that was rightfully his, could not have done so. It is not documented, and to careful scholars that will seem unfortunate, but it gives ample evidence of a painstaking study of the Hayes Papers. The book is written for the general reader in the picturesque, vigorous literary style which made Bowers's *The Tragic Era* popular. It suffers from some of the faults which marked the latter work. Dr. Eckenrode often overstates his case. Referring to Tilden the author says, "He towers over Cleveland like a colossus over an ordinary mortal" (p. 233), and to immigration after the Civil War, "The steamships brought throngs of helots from Europe" (p. 299). The Nordic theory is not mentioned, but it forms the warp and woof of the views on racial questions. There are generalizations which seem far-fetched: "An American jury never convicts a handsome woman" (p. 32). There are assumptions which can

never be proved and which might better be unstated: if David Davis had served on the Electoral Commission and given the decision in favor of Tilden the Republicans would have seated Hayes by force (p. 212). There are adventures in the field of contemporary politics which are sectional challenges: "The Southern States are better governed than Northern; the Southern politicians are, generally, more honest" (p. 225). It will require further evidence to make conclusive the declaration that "the anti-slavery cause offered to selfish interests a perfect cover for the attack" of Northern industrialists (p. 310). The reviewer's neighbors will be shocked to learn that Garfield is put down as the trickiest politician of his age (p. 308). It is evident that the author undertakes to do more than interpret the life of an almost forgotten President. Hayes is called a product of the Western Reserve though neither he nor his forbears ever lived in that region. A minor fault is an annoying tendency toward repetition; particularly in the early chapters: the reader learns, for example, on pages 3, 18, 31, 51, and 52 that Hayes was a man without religious convictions, on pages 16, 18, and 51 that Harvard College was somehow responsible for the want of a definite religion. But in spite of prejudices and dogmatic assertions, the authors (Mrs. Pocahontas Wilson Wight has written several chapters dealing with Hayes's personal life) have produced the best life of the President yet published.

Western Reserve University. ELBERT J. BENTON.

Legislative Principles: the History and Theory of Lawmaking by Representative Government. By Robert Luce, A.M., LL.D., a Member of the Congress of the United States. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930, pp. 667, $6.00.) This is the third volume in a notable series, The Science of Legislation. The first, *Legislative Procedure,* appeared in 1922, and the second, *Legislative Assemblies,* in 1925. It is most fortunate that a busy Congressman, of extensive and varied experience, has had the courage to undertake so arduous a task.

After introductory chapters on the nature, origin, and development of law, Mr. Luce takes up his main theme: the history, description, and criticism of representative legislative institutions. Of the twenty-five chapters, three are devoted to the beginnings of genuine representation and its development in various European countries and in the American colonies and states. Constitutions and statutes are contrasted, and the amending of the organic law is discussed in detail.

Four chapters treat of various schemes of representation, with consideration of majority and plurality elections, of minority or proportional representation, and of the merits and defects of occupational representation. The chapter on apportionment contains an excellent summary of that process under the Constitution.

The subject matter of this treatise is varied and detailed, and the same topic has to be approached from different angles, with results that are sometimes confusing. For example, France's experience in shifting back

and forth from *scrutin de liste* to *scrutin d'arrondissement* is discussed under Minorities (p. 249) and under Districts (p. 387), but the two statements do not agree as to the system now in use.

One of the most interesting and informing chapters deals with Instructions in Congress. Many dramatic illustrations are cited, of differing practices. In presenting Various Views there is some vagueness in making comparisons. For example, Senator Lodge (p. 481) is quoted, "with direct reference to a proposal in his own State", as saying, "It (the constituency) does not undertake to instruct the representatives of other constituencies, but only its own, thereby recognizing the representative character of the member or senator or congressman whom it has chosen. The instructions, moreover, are passed by a meeting where they can be discussed, amended, and modified." That was true of the old-time instructions by a town meeting to its representative in the Massachusetts General Court. But by what "meeting where the instructions can be discussed, amended, and modified" has a Massachusetts representative in Congress ever been instructed?

In the last three chapters Public Opinion and the Initiative and Referendum are discussed in great detail. It would be hard to find in similar compass elsewhere the arguments for and against direct legislation more dispassionately set forth. The author's conclusions from his own observation as to the probable effects of the new system upon our old institutions are more optimistic than his own presentation of arguments would lead the reader to expect. Students will eagerly anticipate the appearance of the closing volume, *Legislative Problems*, in this serviceable series.

Worcester Polytechnic Institute. GEORGE H. HAYNES.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The third quinquennial Anglo-American Historical Conference will meet in London during the first week of July at the Institute of Historical Research. American scholars who find it possible to attend should communicate with Mr. Guy Parsloe, secretary of the Institute, at Malet Street, London, W. C.

The formal report of the proceedings of the International Union of Academies is given in full in the Belgian Academy's *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres,* XVI. 5–7, pp. 326–370.

PERSONAL

Charles Theodore Greve died at Cincinnati on September 4, at the age of 67. He was a member of the American Historical Association, one of the early members of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and a founder of the Ohio Valley Historical Association. He was for many years corresponding secretary of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio. In 1904 he published the *Centennial History of Cincinnati,* in two volumes, which is the best authority on the subject.

Alfred Lewis Pinneo Dennis, professor of International Relations at Clark University, died on November 14, at the age of 56. He had been at Clark University since 1923. He was a graduate of Princeton in the class of 1896, and after studies at Heidelberg, Harvard, and Columbia universities, took his doctorate at Columbia in 1901. He began his service as a teacher at Bowdoin College. He taught one year at the University of Chicago, and a year at Harvard University. His longest service, from 1906 to 1920, was at the University of Wisconsin. During the World War he was a captain in the military intelligence division of the general staff, and assistant military attaché at the American embassy in London, in attendance also at the Peace Conference in Paris. His most recent book was *Adventures in Diplomacy* (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXIV. 368). Other works were *The Anglo-Japanese Alliance* and *Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia* (*ibid.,* XXIX. 772). He also contributed the essay on John Hay in the series of Secretaries of State. He was a frequent and valued contributor to this journal.

William E. Barton, clergyman, author of several biographical studies of Abraham Lincoln and of a *Life of Clara Barton,* died on December 7, at the age of 69.

Robert W. Rogers, Orientalist, professor emeritus at Drew Theological Seminary, died on December 12, at the age of 66. Among his many writ-

ings were a *History of Babylonia and Assyria,* of which the sixth edition was published in 1915, and a *History of Ancient Persia* (1930), which will shortly be reviewed in this journal.

George Edmundson, distinguished churchman and historian, died on July 3, at the age of 82. He was a contributor to the *Cambridge Modern History* and wrote the *History of Holland* in the Cambridge Historical series. He edited for the Hakluyt Society, *Journal of the Travels and Labours of Father Samuel Fritz in the River of the Amazons between 1686 and 1723.* He was one of the experts who prepared the British case in the Venezuela boundary dispute, 1896–1899.

William Holden Hutton, dean of Winchester, died on October 26, at the age of 70. He was Reader in Indian history at Oxford from 1913 to 1920, and Lecturer in Ecclesiastical history at Trinity College, Cambridge. His many publications include *Philip Augustus* in the Foreign Statesmen series, *The Marquess Wellesley* in the Rulers of India series, and *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne,* which is volume VI. in *A History of the English Church.* He edited the *Letters of William Stubbs.* His *Misrule of Henry III.* and his *Simon de Montfort* were volumes of extracts from contemporary writers.

Two eminent French historians died in October, M. Maurice Prou, until recently director of the École des Chartes, and M. Georges Renard, professor at the Collège de France. M. Prou, who was born in 1861, is perhaps best known for his *Manuel de Paléographie Latine et Française* of which the fourth edition was published in 1924. He was librarian of *Médailles* at the Bibliothèque Nationale from 1884 to 1899. He edited many medieval documents. M. Renard was older, having been born in 1854. As a youth he was secretary to Rossel during the Commune, which led to six years of exile. Upon his return in 1879 he received from the French Academy the prize for poetry. His professorship at the Collège de France began in 1907. He has been director of the coöperative *Histoire Universelle du Travail.*

Kristian Setterwall, the eminent Swedish bibliographer, died on June 6. He was interested in a variety of bibliographical undertakings, chiefly in the field of history. For a period of forty years he prepared the bibliographies of Northern history that were published annually in *Historisk Tidskrift.*

Professor V. Barthod, the distinguished Orientalist of Leningrad, died on August 22, at the age of 67. An English translation of his most important work was published by the Gibb Trustees in 1928 under the title of *Turkestan down to the Time of the Mongol Invasions.* This was a revision of an earlier work, and one of its great merits was its utilization of all the existing Arabic and Persian sources.

The University of California at Los Angeles has acquired the larger part of the historical library of the late Professor Kristian Erslev, state

archivist in Copenhagen, a collection valuable for Northern European history.

For the second successive year the Alexander Prize Medal has been awarded to an American, Amos A. Ettinger, of Yale University, for an essay on The Proposed Anglo-Franco-American Treaty of 1852 to guarantee Cuba to Spain.

Additional leaves of absence for the current academic year: for the first half year, *Wellesley College,* Edna V. Moffett; for the second half year, *Harvard University,* Kirsopp Lake; *Wellesley College,* Julia S. Orvis; *Western Reserve University,* C. P. Gould; *Ohio State University,* Carl Wittke; *Indiana University,* Logan Esarey, P. W. Townsend; *Stanford University,* R. H. Lutz.

The following promotions may be noted: *Clark University,* D. E. Lee to be associate professor of Modern European history; *Smith College,* S. R. Packard to be professor; *University of Minnesota,* Alice F. Tyler to be assistant professor; *Iowa State College,* V. Alton Moody to be associate professor; *University of Missouri,* T. A. Brady to be assistant professor.

Changes in departments of history: *Barnard College,* Sterling Tracy, appointed lecturer in Ancient history; *University of Oregon,* J. T. Ganoe, of Marshall College, to be associate professor, J. G. Hazam, of the University of California, to be assistant professor; *University of Washington,* D. G. Barnes, of the University of Oregon, to be professor.

The following visiting lectureships may be noted: *Wellesley College,* L. C. Jane, formerly of the University of Wales; *Barnard College,* Mme. Halidé Edib, formerly professor of Western literature in the University of Istambul. Dr. J. L. La Monte is visiting professor in the *University of Minnesota* for the year.

Dr. Livingstone Porter, formerly of the University of Illinois, is Carnegie visiting professor at the Czech University in Prague during the current year.

Professor Henry S. Lucas, of the University of Washington, is in Belgium on a Guggenheim fellowship.

Mr. G. V. Blue, formerly assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon, has been appointed associate in historical research in the Department of State, at Washington.

The following members of the Association have volumes in press: C. H. Ambler, *History of Transportation in the Ohio Valley* (Arthur H. Clark Company); F. B. Artz, *France under the Bourbon Restoration, 1815–1830* (Harvard University Press); R. J. Bartlett, *John C. Frémont and the Republican Party* (Ohio State University Press); Carl Becker, *Modern European History* (Silver, Burdett and Company); H. E. Bolton, *Anza's California Expeditions,* in 5 vols. (University of California

Press); W. H. Callcott, *Liberalism in Mexico, 1857–1929* (Stanford University Press); O. P. Chitwood, *Colonial America* (Harper and Brothers); C. W. Hackett, an annotated edition in English of Pichardo's *Historical Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas*, vol. I. (University of Texas Press); J. D. Hicks, *The Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party* (University of Minnesota Press); F. B. Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius* (Oxford University Press); T. W. Riker, *The Making of Roumania: a Study of an International Problem, 1856 to 1866* (Clarendon Press).

These projects of publication are nearing completion: W. C. Barnes, *Revolutionary Russia*; J. M. Callahan, *American Foreign Policy in Mexican Relations*; Logan Esarey, *Conquest of the Old Northwest*; Albert Hyma, *Erasmus*; Edward McMahon, *Life of Andrew Johnson*; T. J. Wertenbaker, *Norfolk, Historic Southern Port.*

GENERAL

General review: Henri Sée, *Histoire Économique et Sociale* (Rev. Hist., Sept.).

The *Historical Outlook* for November contains an address by Professor George M. Dutcher on the Characteristics of the Present Age. It was broadcast at Sapporo, Japan, last June, while Professor Dutcher was acting as visiting professor at Hokkaido University, accredited by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The same number contains the first of a series of summaries of reports made to the International Committee of Historical Sciences describing the present status of the teaching of history in many countries. The summaries are prepared by Dr. Joseph Strayer, of Princeton, and Dr. Ruth McMurry of Teachers' College, Columbia University. Professor A. C. Krey has written a preface. The October number of the *Outlook* is similarly devoted to the problems of teaching, the leading article being on the Teaching of History in French Lycées and Collèges. The authors of this study are Professor O. W. Mosher, jr., of Kansas State Teachers' College, and M. Georges Quesnel, ancien Élève du Lycée de Toulouse. In the December number the leading article, by Mr. Hubert P. Beck, of the University of Chicago, endeavors to estimate the Changing Aims and Values of Teaching the Social Studies as disclosed in the *Historical Outlook* and its predecessor, the *History Teacher's Magazine*, since 1909.

The *Journal of Economic and Business History* for October has another article on ancient forms of credit. Its title, Warehousing and Trapezite Banking in Antiquity, will puzzle for a moment the reader whose Greek is hardly more than a pleasant recollection. The author, Professor W. L. Westermann, describes the use of the warehouse in Egypt and Babylonia and shows that exchange in kind was never altogether displaced by the monetary system invented by the Greeks. Evidence of the activity of the new International Scientific Committee on

Price History is to be found in the article of Dr. George R. Taylor on Prices in the Mississippi Valley preceding the War of 1812. A third article by Professor W. G. Schwartz deals with a phase of tariff history, the Proposed Canadian-American Reciprocity Agreement of 1911.

In the *Catholic Historical Review* for October, Reverend Livarius Oliger describes the initial volume of a series of documents bearing on the Franciscan missions in China, edited by Fr. Anastasius Van den Wyngaert under the title of *Sinica Franciscana*, and published by the College of St. Bonaventure at Quaracchi. Here are dealt with names made familiar in Sir Henry Yule's *Cathay and the Way Thither*, Friar John of Plano Carpini, Willem de Rubruquis, and others, but their missionary activities, quite as much as their contributions to the knowledge of geography, are emphasized. Light on the early history of Washington is given by Margaret Brent Downing's article on Significant Achievements of the Daniels Carroll of L'Enfant's Era. In the same number Reverend Edwin Ryan reviews the Papal Concordats in Modern Times.

The October number of the *Journal of Negro History* includes a monograph on Education in Haiti, by Rayford W. Logan, an article by James B. Browning on the North Carolina Black Code, and one by Ben N. Azikiwe entitled Fragments of Onitsha History. The latter contribution sketches the story, beginning with the seventeenth century, of the people of Onitsha town and province, in British Nigeria.

Firmin-Didot has begun the publication in two volumes, profusely illustrated, of an *Histoire Universelle de l'Art* under the direction of Marcel Aubert. Among the collaborators are L. Bréhier, of the University of Clermont-Ferrand, Charles Diehl, of the Sorbonne, and René Grousset, of the Musée Guimet.

Professor Otto Hintze in an article on Weltgeschichtliche Bedingungen der Representativverfassung (*Historische Zeitschrift*, CXLIII. 1) argues that between medieval feudalism and modern representative institutions there is a transitory stage of government by privileged estates. This is not found in the Orient because of the latter's kindred group social organization. The system of estates was most perfected in Western Europe and was aided in its development by the Catholic Church.

A new series of source books in three volumes has been undertaken by R. G. D. Laffan, of Queen's College, Cambridge, of which the first volume is entitled *Select Documents of European History, 800–1492*, and is prepared by the general editor (New York, Holt, pp. xv, 205, $1.75).[1] The materials chosen for translation illustrate the general movement of European history rather than the development of particular countries. For example, France as such appears only toward the close in section VII. with the title, France in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. The emphasis is on the Church and the Empire. There is very little on feudal

[1] The date of publication of books and articles mentioned in the section of Historical News is 1930 unless otherwise stated.

society or economic conditions. The two volumes which are to follow will bring the illustrative material down to 1920. It is needless to say that the work of editing is admirably done.

At this moment when man appears to be suffering from the incidental consequences of excessive mechanization, overmuch organization, and intensive mass production, it is natural to turn with fresh interest to the history of various schemes of a simpler life. These are reviewed, with brevity and clearness of thought, in *Communist and Co-operative Colonies,* by M. Charles Gide, the distinguished economist and historian of the Collège de France. The lectures were originally published in France in 1928 and have been translated by Ernest F. Row (New York, Crowell, pp. 223, $2.50). About a third of the volume is devoted to the many experiments in the United States, including one of the most recent, Fairhope in Alabama. Although Professor Gide confesses that all the earlier communities were failures, he believes it not "unlikely that either in this century or the next these communitarian associations . . . may occupy as large a place in the world as the religious communities did in the Middle Ages".

At the London Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations, held in March, 1929, the Council on Foreign Relations was designated as the national center for such organizations in the United States. In order to assemble accurate and up-to-date information on the work being done in this field in this country, a questionnaire has been sent to each of the organizations now listed at Council headquarters. It is earnestly requested that any organization which has not received such a request send its name and address to the Council at 45 East 65th Street, New York City, and a questionnaire will be forwarded promptly.

An article of interest: H. Delehaye, S.J., *La Méthode Historique et l'Hagiographie* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, XVI. 5–7).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Maurice Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne Grecque et Romaine, l'Année 1929* (Rev. des Quest. Hist., July).

A new French journal has been announced which aims to provide a special medium for the publication of material dealing with the history and antiquities of Asia Minor. It is entitled the *Revue Hittite et Asianique,* is published in Strasbourg, and numbers among its sponsors MM. Cavaignac, Juret, and Delaporte.

Among recent books, mention may be made of the republication of Burkhardt's *Griechische Kulturgeschichte,* in three volumes and but slightly abridged, by Alfred Kröner, Leipzig. The editor, Rudolph Marx, has added numerous notes, and has appended an appreciation of Burkhardt's point of view. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to*

Aristotle (University of Chicago Press, pp. 399, $4.00), by R. J. Bonner and G. E. Smith, is a study of the development of legal institutions in the Greek world. There is a considerable discussion of the much interpreted trial scene on the shield of Achilles, and special prominence is given to the development of judicial institutions at Athens. W. L. Westermann's *Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt* gives an account of the regulations governing the buying and selling of slaves, and some estimate of the relative number of the slave population and of the prevalence of the slave system in Egypt under the Ptolemies, using pap. Columbia 480 as a text.

In the *Journal* of the Royal Asiatic Society, July, there is a report by S. Langdon of the excavations at Kish, 1928–1929. The *Illustrated London News* for October 25 and November 1 gives accounts by Baron Max von Oppenheim of the finds at Tell Halaf. Particularly interesting are some Sabarean-Hittite monuments which he dates about 3000 B.C. These were reused in the palace of an Aramaic prince about 1000 B.C. In the same journal, October 18 and November 1, are accounts by Professor Vassits of Belgrade of new discoveries of house plans and objects at Vinca. Good reviews of the year's discoveries in Greece and in Italy appear in News Items from Athens and News Items from Rome, by E. P. B. and A. W. V. B. respectively, in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for September. One may note also Y. Béquinon's *chronique* of archæological discoveries in the Hellenic East in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, LIII. 2, and A. Grenin's notes on Roman archæology, particularly on material from the Rhine country in *Revue des Études Anciennes* for September.

Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien, by Walther Schwahn (Leipzig, Dieterich, pp. 63), is published as Beiheft XXI. (new series VIII.) of *Klio*.

The popular discussion of Alexander's purpose in journeying to the oasis of Siwa is continued by H. Lamer and by Lehmann-Haupt in *Klio*, XXIV. 1. Wilcken also adds to his former essay on this subject an epilogue in the *Sitzungsberichte* der Preussischen Akademie for March, in which he criticizes the views expressed by Berve in his *Alexanderreich* and by Pasquali in the *Rivista di Filologia*, LVII. 3. To this Pasquali adds a rejoinder in the September number of the same journal. An essay of interest to students of ancient economic history is that of F. Oertel, *Zur Frage der Attischen Grossindustrie* (Rheinisches Museum, LXXIX. 3). Oertel believes that Attic industries were carried on by independent craftsmen to supply a local market, and were not at all capitalistic in character; and that capital in Athens was little interested in other industries than mining.

E. Cicotti's article, Motivi Demografici e Biologici nella Rovina della Civiltà Antica, in *Nuova Rivista Storica* for April, subjects to comparison and criticism the views of O. Seeck, Tenney Frank, M. L. Gordon, and M. P. Nilsson on the decline of the Roman Empire. Weaknesses in the

application of Ellsworth Huntingdon's theory of the effect of climatic changes to the problem of the development and fall of the Roman Empire are pointed out by M. Rostovtzeff, The Decay of the Ancient World and its Economic Explanations, *Economic History Review* for January.

Articles to be noted: R. P. Dougherty, *A Babylonian City in Arabia* (Amer. Jour. Arch., Sept.); F. Chapouthier, *Les Découvertes de Byblos* (Rev. des Études Anc., Sept.); R. P. P. Dhorme, *Le Déluge Babylonien* (Rev. Bibl., Oct.); G. Boson, *Tavolette Cunciformi Sumeri dell' ultima Dinastia di Ur* (Aegyptus, X. 2–4); I. Pendlebury, *Egypt and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age* (Jour. Egypt. Arch., May); R. P. A. Barrois, *Aux Mines de Sinai* (Rev. Bibl., Oct.); F. Petrie, *The Linking of Egypt and Palestine* (Antiquity, Sept.); J. A. Maynard, *The Rights and Revenues of the Jews* (Jour. Soc. Or. Research, XIV. 1); R. P. Dougherty, *The Sea Land of Arabia* (Jour. Amer. Or. Soc., L. 1); H. Weismann, *Israel's Einzug in Kanaan* (Biblica, XI. 2–3); L. W. Batten, *A Crisis in the History of Israel* (Jour. Bibl. Lit., XLIX.); Forrer, *La Découverte de la Grèce Mycénienne dans les Textes Cunéiformes de l'Empire Hittite* (Rev. des Études Grecques, Sept.); A. Götze, *Ueber die Hethitische Königsfamilie* (Archiv Orientální, II. 1); A. Andréades, *The Finance of Tyrant Governments in Ancient Greece* (Econ. Hist., Jan.); C. Picard, *Le "Présage" de Cléomènes et la Divination sur l'Acropole d'Athènes* (Rev. des Études Grecques, Sept.); G. de Sanctis, *Gli Ostaggi Egineti in Atene e la Guerra fra Atene ed Egina* (Riv. di Fil., Sept.); A. Momigliano, *La Spedizione Ateniese in Egitto* (Aegyptus, X. 2–4); M. Guarducci, *Demiurgi in Creta* (Riv. di Fil., LVIII. 1); R. Flacelière, *Recueil des Listes Amphictyoniques de Delphes à l'Époque de la Domination Étolienne* (Bull. Corr. Hellénique, LIII. 2); A. Momigliano, *Il Decreto Trilingue in Onore di Tolomeo Filopatore e la quarta Guerra di Celesiria* (Aegyptus, X. 2–4); M. Merzagora, *La Navigazione in Egitto nell' Età Greco-Romana* (*ibid.*); N. Greipl, *Ueber eine Ptolemäerinschrift* (Philologus, LXXXV. 2); W. Spiegelberg, *Eine neue Erwähnung eines Aufstandes in Oberägypten in der Ptolemäischen Periode* (Zeitsch. f. Aegypt. Sprach- und Alterthumskunde, LXV. 1); E. Ciaceri, *Influssi della Civiltà Italiota* (*Magna Graecia*) *sull'Etruria nel Sec. vi a. c.* (Klio, XXIII. 3); A. Klotz, *Die Geographischen Commentarii des Agrippa und ihre Uebereste* (*ibid.*, XXIV. 1); K. Lehmann, *Das Kannä-Rätsel* (*ibid.*), and compare E. Obst in the same; M. Holleaux, *La Date de la Première Guerre Romaine d'Illyrie* (Rev. des Études Grecques, Sept.); G. Niccolini, *Note Cronologiche su alcuni Tribuni della Plebe* (Historia, IV. 1); P. Collart, *Note sur les Mouvements des Troupes qui ont précédé la Bataille de Philippes* (Bull. Corr. Hellénique, LIII. 2); J. E. Eubanks, *Navigation on the Tiber* (Class. Jour., June); A. De Grassi, *Il Papiro 1026 della Società Italiana e i Diplomi Militari Romani* (Aegyptus, X. 2–4); W. M. Calder, *A Galatian Estate of the Sergii Paulli* (Klio, XXIV. 1); E. Hesselmeyer, *Was ist und Was Heisst Decumatland?* (*ibid.*); E. Gerland, *In welchem Jahre gelangte Konstantin der Grosse zur Alleinherrschaft* (Byz. Zeitsch.,

XXX. 1); J. R. Palanque, *Une Nouvelle Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Rev. Hist., July); A. Segrè, *Note sulla Compravendita in Diritto Greco e Romano* (Aegyptus, X. 2–4).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Vincenzo Porri, *La Storia Economica Europa, Età Medioevale e Moderna* (Riv. Stor. Ital., June).

In the October number of *Speculum*, Emma G. Salter evaluates the sources for the biography of St. Francis of Assisi and "the results of recent criticism upon them". Among the other contents may be noted especially The Great European Famine of 1315, 1316 and 1317, by Henry S. Lucas; Many-Sided Career of Master Elias of Dereham, by J. C. Russell; Orleanese Formularies in a Manuscript at Tarragona, by C. H. Haskins; and the reviews by J. F. Willard of the *Calendar of the Fine Rolls*, vol. XI., *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, vol. II., *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, vol. VI.; by A. J. Barnouw of H. S. Lucas's *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years' War, 1326–1347*; and by N. S. B. Gras of N. Neilson's *The Cartulary and Terrier of the Priory of Bilsington*.

In the review of Professor Louis Halphen's *Les Barbares, des Grandes Invasions aux Conquêtes Turques du XI^e Siècle* [Peuples et Civilisations] (Paris, Alcan, pp. 437, 50 fr.) printed in this journal (XXXII. 573), Professor Duncalf regretted the lack of an index and pointed out that the bibliographical notes were brief and referred chiefly to general works. In this revised edition there is a good index of thirty-two pages and a supplementary list of eight pages containing for the most part titles which have appeared since the book was published in 1926, and which have been useful in revising the work. (On page 396 there is one slip—the second volume of Vasiliev's *History of the Byzantine Empire* was published in 1929.) There are two useful folding maps "Pour servir à l'étude des grandes migrations" of which the second including Asia, Europe, and part of Africa is especially valuable. M. Halphen has also supplied a conclusion in which he combats M. Pirenne's views concerning the importance of the Moslem conquests. The 393 pages of the original work have been reprinted from the plates with such corrections as M. Halphen has found necessary.

In the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1930, Heft III., Heinz Dannenbauer reënforces Karl Heldmann's view of the coronation of Charlemagne at Christmas, 800. The empire concerned was the actual *Imperium Romanum* of the time. By imperial decree, *c.* 740, only the emperor could take action against "Majestätsverbrechen", and to bring Charlemagne's procedure against the opponents of the pope into accord with Roman law, he was made emperor by acclamation of the people. Coronation added nothing to the power thus conferred and his kingship over Franks and Lombards remained as separate and distinct from the imperial authority. The Germanizing of this *Imperium* began when

Louis the Pious was made associate emperor without action on the part of the Roman *populus*.

A new edition of F. B. Gummere's *Germanic Origins* has been published under the title, *Founders of England*, with supplementary notes by F. P. Magoun, jr. (New York, Stechert).

The Mediaeval Academy has just published *Genoese Shipping in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* by Professor Eugene H. Byrne. This volume is no. 1 of the Monographs of the Mediaeval Academy of America.

M. Seymour de Ricci has compiled, and the New York Public Library has published, a list of medieval manuscripts in the New York Public Library. This is the first publication of the results of the work undertaken by the American Council of Learned Societies through the Library of Congress: the preparation of lists of all the medieval manuscripts in the United States.

Among the forthcoming volumes announced by the Records of Civilization are: *Calendar Reform in the Thirteenth Century*, by Mary C. Welborn; *Helmold: Slavic Chronicle*, by Francis J. Tschan; *Old Norwegian Law: the Guta-Things-Law and the Frostathings Law*, by Laurence M. Larson; *Pierre Dubois: on the Recovery of the Holy Land*, by W. I. Brandt; and *William of Tyre: History of Things done in the Lands beyond the Sea*, by Mrs. W. M. Babcock and A. C. Krey.

In listing important periodical literature of different countries in *Le Moyen Age* (Jan.) the heading, "Etats-Unis d'Amérique", is followed by the statement, "Sera traité à part en raison de l'énorme production en 1929".

For the new edition of the late Professor Paetow's *Guide*, which will be published shortly after this issue of the *Review* appears, a group of specialists have prepared a long section on Place Names for various countries. To the material in this section should be added: Early Names of Britain by Eilert Ekwall, in *Antiquity*, June, and the second volume of *The Place-Names of Sussex*, by Mr. A. Mawer and others.

Articles: L. Thorndike, *Prospectus for a Corpus of Medieval Scientific Literature in Latin* (Isis, Oct.); N. Brian Chaninov, *Les Écrits Théologiques Russes du Moyen Age* (Rev. d'Hist. Ecclés., July); R. Stadelmann, *Jacob Burckhardt und das Mittelalter* (Hist. Zeitsch., CXLII., Heft 3); Marc Bloch, *Du Monde Antique au Monde Barbare* (Rev. de Synthèse Hist., June); D. De Bruyne, *La Première Règle de S. Benoît* (Rev. Bénédict., Oct.); L. C. Mackinney, *Bishop Fulbert of Chartres: Teacher, Administrator, Humanist* (Isis, Oct.); E. Sabbe, *La Réforme Clunisienne en Flandre au Début du XII^e Siècle* (Rev. Belge de Philol. et d'Hist., Jan.); R. L. Reynolds, *Merchants of Arras and the Overland Trade with Genoa, Twelfth Century* (*ibid.*, Apr.); Clemens Minarik, O.F.M., *Litteratura Bohemica Occasione VII. Centenarii a Transitu S. Francisci Publicata* (Arch. Francis. Hist., July); Karl

Helleiner, *Der Einfluss der Papsturkunde auf die Diplome der Deutschen Könige im Zwölften Jahrhundert* (Mittl. des Oesterreich. Inst. für Geschichtsforschung, Band XLIX., Heft 1); Abbé T. Welter, *Un Nouveau Recueil Franciscain d'Exempla de la Fin du XII^e Siècle* (Études Francis., July, concluded in Sept.); Luigi Chiappelli, *La Formazione Storica del Commune Cittadino in Italia, Territorio Lombardo-Tosco* (Archiv. Stor. Ital., series VII., vol. XIII.); Léon Le Grand, *Comment composer l'Histoire d'un Établissement Hospitalier, Sources et Méthode* (Rev. d'Hist. de l'Église de Fr., Apr.); H. J. Pybus, *The Emperor Frederick I. and the Sicilian Church* (Cam. Hist. Jour., vol. III., no. 2); Laura H. Loomis, *Geoffrey of Monmouth and Stonehenge* (Mod. Lang. Assoc., June); E. Rodocanachi, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la Faillite de la Haute Banque Florentine* (Acad. des Sci. Mor. et Pol.: Séances et Travaux, May); Clemens Bauer, *Mittelalterliche Staatsfinanz und Internationale Hochfinanz* (Hist. Jahrb., Heft 50); John Saltmarch, *The Office of Receiver-General on the Estates of King's College* (Cam. Hist. Jour., vol. III., no. 2); Frances M. Page, *The Customary Poor Law of Three Cambridgeshire Manors* (*ibid.*).

D. C. M., G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General reviews: Paul Fierens, *Chronique d'Histoire de l'Art, Saison Romantique* (Rev. des Quest. Hist., July); Louis Villat, *Chronique d'Histoire Contemporaine, la Restauration* (*ibid.*); Gino Luzzatto, *Rassegna di Storia del Diritto* [11th–18th centuries] (N. Riv. Stor., May); Piero Pieri, *Rassegna di Storia Militare* [chiefly dealing with the World War] (*ibid.*); Major T. H. Thomas, *Some War Memoirs* (Jour. of Mod. Hist., Dec.).

The leading article in the *Journal of Modern History* for December deals with Napoleonic Policy and the Project of a Descent upon England. Professor Harold C. Deutsch is the author. Other articles are: Polish Historical Writing, by Dr. William J. Rose, of Dartmouth College, and Russia and the United States at the Time of the Civil War, by E. A. Adamov, of the Russian archives. This is supplemented by a translation of the documents in the case, which were previously described here by the late Professor F. A. Golder (XXXI. 462). The bibliographical article, by William Miller, gives an account of Modern Greek History in the "Gennadeion".

Professor Ferdinand Schevill has revised and enlarged his *History of Europe from the Reformation to the Present Day* (New York, Harcourt, Brace, pp. 865, $3.75). So much new material has been made available since the first edition in 1925 that the last ten chapters have been substantially rewritten. In addition many significant events which call for comment have taken place in the five intervening years. The situation which immediately resulted in the World War is explained in two chapters

instead of one. There are two final chapters of special interest: The International and Disarmament Movements since the War and The Civilization of the Twentieth Century. The latter is an attempt to interpret the spirit of revolt against the past which seems characteristic of the present age.

A new source book or selections for collateral reading is always welcome because it facilitates the task of the college teacher in arranging exercises on historical problems. *Readings in European History since 1814*, by Jonathan F. Scott and Alexander Baltzly (New York, Crofts, pp. xxv, 689, $3.50), is a well-proportioned collection. The editors have resisted the temptation to emphasize especially the World War and its causes, giving only two chapters to this subject. They have laid stress upon social and economic developments. Their selections are taken sometimes from contemporary writers, sometimes from recent historical works.

A publication which students of the recent history of Europe have been eagerly awaiting is *Die Denkwürdigkeiten des Fürsten Bülow*, which will be in four volumes. The first two volumes cover the period from Bülow's appointment as secretary of state to his resignation as chancellor. A French translation is being published by Plon.

Professor Fay's *The Origins of the World War* is now available in a revised edition, the two volumes bound in one (New York, Macmillan, pp. xxiv, 569, 577, $4.00). This has given the author an opportunity to rewrite a few passages, but without changing the paging, and to comment in seventeen pages of Supplementary Notes upon any new evidence, particularly that offered by the Austrian documents, the French documents, and the new volumes of British documents. He has also taken account of the interpretations given by Professor Schmitt's *Coming of the War*, making interesting statements upon such differences of view as appear. Professor Fay remarks that the contents of the great Austrian collection incline him "in some respects to a less severe judgment on Austrian policy as compared with that of Russia. . . . Austria, in acting against Serbia, was taking the only step by which she believed she could preserve her very existence as a state. Russia, however, in claiming to protect Serbia and to exercise a kind of protection over the Balkan Slavs, did not have any such vital interest at stake; her existence as a state was not in jeopardy; her interest was more to preserve and increase her prestige. Austria's action aimed at a localized war. Russia's action made inevitable a European War".

Herr von Jagow's comments on M. Poincaré's reply to the Gerin questions are printed in an English translation in the September number of the *Berliner Monatshefte*.

The Home University Library has added two volumes on the situation resulting from the late war: *The Political Consequences of the Great War*, by Ramsay Muir, and *Some Economic Consequences of the Great War*, by A. L. Bowley (New York, Holt, $1.25).

In the three Rhodes Memorial Lectures which make up his slender volume entitled *The World Crisis of 1914–1918* (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 57, $2.00), M. Élie Halévy does not propose to study what any particular sovereign or minister might have done at any given hour to prevent war. "Pills to cure an earthquake!" he exclaims, and declares that he will study the earthquake itself. He explains that the period was one of revolution as well as of war, revolutionary socialism, and a still more powerful force, revolutionary nationalism. How much more powerful nationalism was, he illustrates effectively by pointing out that even the Russian Revolution "acted as a solvent of imperialism for the benefit, not so much of Communism, or even of Socialism, as of nationality". It was this revolutionary nationalism, acting as a disruptive force within the decadent Hapsburg state, that gave occasion for the war.

In the *Berliner Monatshefte* for November appears a translation of an article by Professor M. Pokrowski on *Die Russischen Dokumente des Imperialistischen Krieges,* which explains incidentally the state of the project for the publication of these documents. Five volumes of the first series are now practically completed, of which volumes I. and IV. are in press. A German firm is to control the rights of translation and publication outside of Russia. It is proposed that the German translation and the original should appear simultaneously in order to forestall the publication of garbled selections. The five volumes cover the period from January 1 to August 4, 1914. This point of departure was chosen because by that time all the elements of the situation out of which the war came were present.

Volume VI. of M. Poincaré's memoirs appeared on December 8 with the subtitle *Les Tranchées,* 1915 (Paris, Plon, 30 fr.).

The British *liaison* officer at the headquarters of the French Fifth Army, then Lieutenant, later Brigadier General E. L. Spears, has thrown considerable light upon the misunderstandings of Sir John French and General Lanrezac in a volume entitled *Liaison 1914, a Narrative of the Great Retreat* (London, Heinemann, pp. xxix, 597, 25 s.). Neither French nor Lanrezac spoke the other's language. They so differed in temperament that coöperation soon became impossible.

La Division de Fer, 1914–1918, by General H. Colin (Paris, Payot, pp. 223, 18 fr.), is the history of the 11th division of the French army and is written from the official records and from the recollections of surviving officers of the four regiments. One of these is General Azan, whose name is familiar to Americans. The "Iron" division at the opening of the war belonged to the 20th corps which was then commanded by General Foch.

Articles: Luigi Arezio, *Rinascimento Umanesimo e Spirito Moderno* (N. Antologia, July 1); Malet du Theil, *Un Économiste au XVIII^e Siècle: Henri de Bertin, 1720–1792,* I., concl. (N. Rev., July 15, Aug. 1); Alfred Stern, *Georg Klindworth* [once well-known, now forgotten secret agent of the second third of the nineteenth century] (Hist. Vierteljahr.,

Sept.); Maximilian Claar, *Die Abkehr Italiens vom Dreibund und das Kabinett Zardanelli-Prinetti, 1901–1903* [based upon Claar's diaries while *Pressechef* for the Austro-Hungarian embassy at Rome, foreign editor of the *Popolo Romano*, and representative of various German and Austrian journals] (Eur. Gespr., Aug.); Freiherr Ludwig Rüdt von Collenberg, *Die Deutschen Heeresverstärkungen von 1871 bis 1914* (B. Monatsh., Nov.); J. J. Jusserand, *Le Sentiment Américain pendant la Guerre*, I., concl. [personal recollections] (Rev. des D. M., Sept. 15, Oct. 1); Georges Fotino, *Une Séance Historique au Conseil de la Couronne, 3 Août 1914* [Roumania's decision to maintain neutrality] (*ibid.*, Aug. 1); Albert Pingaud, *Études Diplomatiques: les Projets d'Intervention Japonaise, 1914–1917* [idea of bringing Japanese forces to Europe seemed desirable to French, impossible to English, unnecessary to Russians] (*ibid.*, Sept. 1); Youri Danilov, *La Décomposition de l'Armée Russe au Début de la Révolution* (*ibid.*, Nov. 1).

GREAT BRITAIN

The *English Historical Review* for October contains another of Professor F. S. Rodkey's studies on the diplomatic situation in the 'thirties and 'forties of the nineteenth century, discussing the Views of Palmerston and Metternich on the Eastern Question in 1834. The leading article is a continuation of Professor James Tait's treatment of the English towns. Its title is The Borough Community in England. Other articles are Elections and Electioneering, by Mrs. Eric George, and Russia, Prussia, and Great Britain, 1742–1744, by Sir Richard Lodge.

To *History* for October, Sir Richard Lodge contributes the Historical Revision, no. LV., on the Maritime Powers in the Eighteenth Century. His aim is to show the difficulties which confronted the attempt of England and Holland to act together, although the term "Maritime Powers" seemed to indicate that they were a unit. A decisive break came during the American Revolutionary War, but the diplomacy of Sir James Harris restored the situation in 1787. The same number contains two general review articles: General Economic History, by Principal J. F. Rees, and Recent Works on the Teaching of History, by Mr. J. A. White.

With the November number the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research has begun the issue of an annual *Supplement* to include additions, year by year, to the *Guide to the Historical Publications of the Societies of England and Wales*, which will bring the lists down to the close of 1928, and which is in an advanced state of preparation. The first supplement covers the publications of 1929. The *Bulletin* itself continues its record of the migrations of MSS. Its leading article is on The Parliaments of Edward III., by Mr. H. G. Richardson and Mr. George Sayles, and is to be continued. In an appendix to the article is given a list of these Parliaments, with the term, place, and indication of records and chronicles for each.

The Public Record Office has initiated the practice of appointing from time to time postgraduate students, who intend to take up university teaching, as learners or apprentices, to be trained in the work of the national archives as if they were new assistant keepers of the public records. It is hoped that at the close of two years of service each student will have become "no mere palæographer or laborious expert of a single class, but stand possessed of an adequate general knowledge of the various and often intricate strands from which alone sound history may be woven".

Although the fort at Housesteads and the adjacent part of Hadrian's Wall have been turned over to the National Trust, this historic monument is threatened by the approach of quarries, which will destroy the setting even if they do not undermine the wall. Personages of note in the literary and historical world, like Mr. Rudyard Kipling, the Right Honorable H. A. L. Fisher, and Sir Charles Oman, are endeavoring to press upon the attention of the government the necessity of safeguarding the scene and the monument through parliamentary action.

The third part of the *Parochial Collections*, made by Anthony Wood and Richard Rawlinson, translated and edited by Mr. F. N. Davis, of Pembroke College, has now been published by the Oxfordshire Record Society (pp. 390). There are references to over twelve hundred names. Occasionally the entry explains the extent of the village or what the living is worth. Many inscriptions are reproduced.

In the May *Bulletin* of the Board of Celtic Studies of the University of Wales are printed Two Early Caernarvonshire Accounts, the first a Lay Subsidy Account, dated 1293, belonging to the manor of Nevyn, a royal residence situated on an important pilgrim road and near the monastery of Bardsey, the second a sheriff's account for the county of Caernarvon of the year 1306–1307.

At the annual meeting of the British Society for Nautical Research last July, it was announced that the establishment of a National Maritime Museum in Queen's House, Greenwich, once the residence of Henrietta Maria, wife of Charles I., will be an actuality as soon as the Royal Hospital School is able to vacate that building. Collections for the museum are already in hand, including the Mercury collection of ship models and the Macpherson collection of paintings, prints, charts, and atlases. There are to be collections of relics of Drake, Blake, and Nelson. A recent letter of Nelson, presented by Lord Northbrook, contains a candid opinion of "that vile fellow Buonaparte", and declares that "I have long known him to be a Thief, a Lyar, and Murderer". This letter was written off Toulon on October 13, 1803. The new president of the society is Admiral of the Fleet, Earl Beatty.

According to M. Georges Ascoli, who has written two volumes on *La Grande-Bretagne devant l'Opinion Française au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, Gamber, 2 vols., pp. 894, 100 fr.), Anglomania had not yet manifested

itself in France, but curiosity was active. The violence of the mid-century troubles gave the English as bad a reputation with their neighbor as the Reign of Terror gave the French with the English of the next century. M. Ascoli has drawn upon the records of travelers as well as upon expressions of opinion in the literature of the time. His bibliographical list is unusually full.

By a skillful selection of passages from Walpole's letters, Alfred Bishop Mason has drawn a picture of *Horace Walpole's England* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, pp. xiv, 398, $5.00). The choice is made from Mrs. Toynbee's edition of the "Letters" and from Paget Toynbee's supplementary volumes. The volume is illustrated. Walpole's comments upon the troubles in America are always acute. It is interesting to be reminded of what he wrote on May 7, 1775, before he heard of the affair at Lexington: "There is, indeed, beyond the seas an opposition, so big, that most folks call it a rebellion, which if computed by the tract of country it occupies, we, as so diminutive in comparison, ought to be called in rebellion to that."

M. Roger Boutet de Monvel, whose *Les Anglais à Paris, 1800–1850,* found so many interested readers, has now published *Grands Seigneurs et Bourgeois d'Angleterre* (Paris, Plon, pp. 262, 15 fr.). This is made up of three portraits, George Selwyn, Fanny Burney, and William Beckford. The sketch of Selwyn utilizes to the full the contrast between his reputation and his idiosyncrasies. A man who could doze at the salon of Mme. du Deffand and still be regarded as interesting, who was esteemed a wit while hardly an amusing or pointed remark of his is remembered, presents problems to the literary portraitist.

Articles: J. R. Clemens, *Elizabethan Coast Artillery* (The Coast Artillery, June); C. R. Boxer, *The Third Dutch War in the East, 1672–74* (Mariner's Mirror, Oct.); Ferdinand Tonnies, *Die Lehre von den Volksversammlungen und die Urversammlung in Hobbes' Leviathan* (Zeit. für die Gesamte Staatswiss., LXXXIX. 1); Fernand Baldensperger, *Une Grande Anglaise de France: Lady Bolingbroke* [1675–1750] (Rev. de P., Sept. 15); Sir Wilkinson Bird, *British Land Strategy in the Seven Years' War* (Army Quar. Rev., Oct.); Ch. Bastide, *Un Aventurier Français en Angleterre au Dix-huitième Siècle* [George Psalmanaazaar] (Rev. des Sci. Pol., July).

FRANCE

The revived interest of the French in their marine is illustrated in a small volume entitled *Vagues Sanglantes, Victoires Navales d'Autrefois,* by B. de Pirey Saint-Alby (Paris, Plon, pp. 266, 15 fr.). It describes in vivid detail three battles, that before Genoa on September 1, 1638, the struggle of Linois's squadron with the English in July, 1801, off Algeciras, and the fight with the Chinese in the Min River in 1884. The first sketch has a special interest for the account which it gives of the equipment and operation of galleys in the navy of the old régime.

La Fayette, a Bibliography, compiled by Stuart W. Jackson (New York, William Edwin Rudge, pp. xxi, 226), owes its origin to the author's interest as a collector of books and pamphlets upon La Fayette, and lists a thousand titles found in American and European libraries, including the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale. Its additions to other lists are chiefly in American titles, the abundance of which testifies to La Fayette's undying fame here, in spite of all the criticism of his abilities as a French statesman.

It is announced that the publication of the works of Robespierre, long interrupted, will be resumed in 1931. The Société des Études Robespierristes has recently made an agreement with Firmin-Didot for this purpose.

The *Annales de l'Est*, conducted by the Faculty of Letters of the University of Nancy, includes among the publications of its 44th year a *Bibliographie Lorraine* (Nancy, Paris, Strasbourg, Berger-Levrault, pp. xii, 621, 50 fr.) covering the period January, 1926–December 31, 1927. This is the ninth of the series. Among the collaborators the historians are Professor R. Parisot and Professor Fr. Braesch. The plan, it will be recalled, is to review in *chroniques* in successive chapters the publications on the archæology, the history, and the literature of Lorraine for various periods. These *chroniques* are followed by more formal reviews of works of especial importance. There is a careful index. The *Annales* for 1930 also includes the *Annuaire de la Fédération Historique Lorraine* for 1929 (pp. vi, 112, 10 fr.).

Articles: P. Boissonnade, *Une Étape Capitale de la Mission de Jeanne d'Arc: le Séjour de la Pucelle à Poitiers* [especially the official inquiry into the authenticity of her mission] (Rev. des Quest. Hist., July); J. Calmette, *Le Règne de Louis XII.* (Jour. des Sav., Apr.); Gaston Dodu, *Henri III.* [remarkable character study] (Rev. Hist., Sept.); Maximin Delaroche, *Le Testament Politique du Cardinal de Richelieu* (*ibid.*); Jacques Hatt, *Le Loyalisme des Alsaciens depuis le Traité de Ryswick jusqu'à la Révolution* (*ibid.*); E. Préclin, *Edmond Richer*, I., II. [bibliography and life] (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., July, Sept.); Comte de Provence, *Lettres à la Comtesse de Balbi* [1789–1794] (Rev. des D. M., July 1); Paul Leuillot, *L'Usure Judaïque en Alsace sous l'Empire et la Restauration* [supplements the volume of Robert Anchel on *Napoléon et les Juifs*, reviewed in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXIV. 123] (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., May); Marc Bloch, *La Lutte pour l'Individualisme Agraire en France du XVIII^e Siècle* [part 2] (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Oct. 15); Alessandro Cutolo, *"L'Affaire du Collier" nelle Lettere di un Diplomatico Napoletano* [Luigi Pio] (N. Antol., Aug. 1); J. J. Jusserand, *La Jeunesse du Citoyen Genêt, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., XLIV. 3); Robert Bigo, *Une Grammaire de la Bourse en 1789* [commentary on M. J. D. Martin's *Étrennes Financières*, published in January, 1789, and which explained operations in the Rue Vivienne] (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Oct. 15); L. de Cardenal, *Les Subsistances dans le Département de la Dordogne*, concl.

(Rév. Fr., Apr.); F. M. Kircheisen, *Quelques Lettres Inédites de Napoléon Ier ou Adressées à l'Empereur par des Souverains Européens* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., XLIV. 3); Luigi Arezio, *Talleyrand e Murat nella Restaurazione Legittimista, secóndo Nuovi Documenti* [from public and private Neapolitan archives] (N. Antol., Oct. 1); Paul Harsin, *La Révolution Belge de 1830 et l'Influence Française* (Rev. des Sci. Pol., Apr.); Lanzac de Laborie, *L'Amitié de Tocqueville et de Royer-Collard, d'après une Correspondance Inédite* (Rev. des D. M., Aug. 15); Henri Malo, *Thiers et les Journées de Juillet* (*ibid.*); S. Posener, *La Révolution de Juillet et le Département du Gard, d'après des Documents des Archives Nationales* [contrary to usual opinion, there was unrest in the provinces] (Mercure de Fr., Aug. 1); Jacques Laffitte, *Les Trois Glorieuses: Souvenirs de la Révolution et de l'Empire, mes Deux Ministères, 1830–1831* [portions of unpublished memoirs] (Rev. des D. M., July 15, Sept. 15, Oct. 1); P. de Barante, *L'Ambassade du Baron de Barante à la Cour de Sardaigne, 1830–1835* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., XLIV. 3); G. Lefranc, *La Construction des Chemins de Fer et l'Opinion Publique vers 1830* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., July); *id., Les Chemins de Fer devant le Parlement Français, 1835–1842* (*ibid.*, Sept.); Général Cousin de Montauban, Comte de Palikao, *La Reddition d'Abd-el-Kader: Souvenirs* (Rev. de P., Aug. 15); Martial de Pradel de Lamase, *Le Ministère de la Marine sous la Commune* (*ibid.*, July 15); Napoléon III., *Lettres à l'Impératrice Eugénie, 1870–1871* [published from the archives of the Prince Napoleon at Brussels] (Rev. des D. M., Sept. 1); Ernest d'Hauterive, *Correspondance Inédite du Prince Napoléon et d'Émile Ollivier, 1871–1873* (*ibid.*, Oct. 15).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

It is a pleasure to record that Professor Henri Pirenne has been appointed to a professorship at the University of Brussels although in June last he became Professor Emeritus of the University of Ghent.

Les Manuscrits de Droit Médiéval de l'Ancienne Abbaye des Dunes à Bruges, by A. De Poorter and J. Brys (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, July), is an inventory of a rich and little known collection, consisting of sixty-two volumes now in the public library of Bruges and several manuscripts in the episcopal seminary of that city.

Les Rapports Diocésains de la Province Ecclésiastique de Malines et du Diocèse de Liége au Saint-Siège, publiés d'après les Archives de la Congrégation du Concile, rattachées aux Archives Vaticanes, edited by J. Paquay (Tongres, Mihiels, pp. viii, 164), constitute an essential source for the religious situation in the Netherlands from 1590 to 1800.

Two articles of interest: H. Vander Linden, *Histoire de notre Nom National* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, XVI. 4); P. Hymans, *La Vie Intellectuelle* [in Belgium] *de 1830 à 1930* (*ibid.*, XVI. 5–7).

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Nine contemporary pamphlets dealing with the revolt of the knights are printed *in extenso* and five others summarized by K. Schottenloher in *Flugschriften zur Ritterschaftsbewegung des Jahres 1523* (Munster, Aschendorff, 1929, pp. xii, 131).

Widely removed from the flood of popular biographies professing to analyze the minds of their heroes, H. Wendorf's *Martin Luther: der Aufbau seiner Persönlichkeit* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1930, pp. 311) is a serious effort to interpret Luther in terms of scientific psychology. The emphasis is laid on three sides of his personality, the type of his piety, his eschatological view of history, and the type of his impelling motives.

To those who associate the Emperor Francis Joseph with the immobile countenance familiar in the portraiture of his later years, the livelier lines of attitude expressed in his letters to his mother will bring some surprise. These letters are now available in *Briefe Kaiser Franz Josephs I. an seine Mutter, 1838–1872* (Munich, Verlag Jos. Kösel and Friedr., 15 M.). The introduction is by Dr. Franz Schnürer. After the defeats of 1859, Francis Joseph referred to the policy of Napoleon III. as the "unprecedented swindle of the arch-ruffian". When Austria had been crushed by Prussia, he reflected that "At last one can see clearly the infamous conduct and cunning deception of which we have been the victim".

In the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* for September, Professor Erich Keyser of Danzig expresses the opinion that the loss of population in the holocaust of 1914–1918, combined with the declining birth rate that naturally followed, makes imperative the study of the history of population. The work should be organized as a distinct field. The objects of this investigation are, he remarks, population groups, numbers, types, physical and mental, and locations. What has already been done he finds scattered and fragmentary, and, at least so far as Germany is concerned, only a beginning.

Hugh Wiley Puckett's *Germany's Women Go Forward* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1930, pp. xi, 329, $4.50) is a significant contribution to the writings on the history of the feminist movement. The book presents a survey of the changes in the status of women in the social, economic, and political life of Germany. Mr. Puckett concludes that the present day "woman question" in Germany can be solved only on the basis of coöperation with men, and not through mere rivalry. A helpful bibliography is included in the volume.

Articles: Karl Schambach, *Eine Nachlese zum Prozess Heinrichs des Löwen* (Histor. Vierteljahr., XXV. 3); Fritz Rörig, *Les Raisons Intellectuelles d'une Suprématie Commerciale: la Hanse* [with bibliography] (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Oct. 15); Wilhelm Stolze, *Die Bedeutung Württembergs für den Bauernkrieg und die Bezeichnung Bauernkrieg* (*ibid.*, XXV. 3); Konrad Lehmann, *Die Ablehnung des*

Englischen Bündnisantrags, 1898–1901 [failure of negotiations chiefly due to the shortsighted policy of William II.] (Preus. Jahrb., Aug.); Emmanuel Urbas, *Der Kaiser Franz Joseph,* I., concl. [steady decline of Austria during his reign due in large measure to his personal defects as ruler] (*ibid.,* Sept.).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

As vol. LIV., fasc. iii, of the Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria, Francesco Poggi has made a study of *Le Guerre Civili di Genova in Relazione con un Documento Economico-Finanziario dell'Anno 1576* (Genoa, Soc. Lig. d. Sto. Patr., 1930, pp. xii, 176). In successive chapters, he discusses certain aspects of the Italian civil wars, those of Genoa from the rise of the commune to 1528 and the Genoese struggles from 1571 to 1575. The document, which is a proportionate division of the costs of the war of 1575 among certain noble families participating, is of historical value in estimating the wealth of the old Genoese nobility.

One of the distinguishing merits of Dr. Louis O'Brien's thesis on *Innocent XI. and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (Berkeley, California, Associated Students' Store, pp. 231, $5.00) is the soundness of its basis in the examination of the archives and manuscript collections at Paris and at Rome. Moreover, the author's frankness in dealing with delicate questions of ecclesiastical history is reassuring. He reaches the conclusion that while the pope rejoiced, as would be expected, in the extinction of heresy, the methods that Louis XIV. used were repugnant to his natural benevolence of spirit and to his well-understood opinions. It is worth noting that if Louis hoped to gain favor with the pope for his act revoking the Edict of Nantes his expectation was disappointed. Innocent was not at all inclined to accept this as a set-off against the Four Articles of 1682.

A great inventory of manuscripts dealing with the Spanish Jews, found in the royal and episcopal archives and in those of the military orders, has been under way for the past four years, sponsored by the Akademie f. d. Wissenschaft des Judentums, as the basis of a critical history of this subject. Edited by F. Baer, it is entitled *Die Juden im Christlichen Spanien,* part I., *Urkunden und Regesten.* The first volume is devoted to *Aragonien und Navarra* (Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1929, pp. xxviii, 1157). A second volume on Castile is announced.

Volume I. of a new Portuguese history of the empire of Portugal in the East has appeared under the title of *Subsidios para a História Militar Marítima da India, 1585–1669,* by Alfredo Botelho de Sousa (Lisbon, Imprensa da Armada, pp. 666). This volume covers the period to 1605 and deals with administrative as well as naval problems. The author successfully contends with the notion that the loss of the Portuguese empire in the East was primarily due to the annexation of Portugal by Philip II. He remarks incidentally that the Spaniards even after this event were

excluded from trade in the East Indies, except, of course, with the Philippines. The fundamental causes of decadence lay in the corruption of most of the officials.

Articles: Willy Cohn, *Storia della Flotta Siciliana sotto il Governo di Carlo I. d'Angiò* [1266–1273] (Archiv. Stor. per la Sicilia Orientale, anno XXV., fasc. ii–iii); Carmelina Naselli, *Litteratura e Scienza nel Convento Benedettino di S. Nicolò l'Arena di Catania* [detailed account of the learned labors of a Benedictine monastery from the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries inclusive; bibliography of 182 items] (*ibid.*); Domenico Gnoli, *I Romani sulla Fine del Medio Evo,* I., concl. (N. Antol., June 16, July 1); Renaud Przezdziecki, *Ambasciatori Veneti in Polonia* [15th–18th centuries] (*ibid.,* July 1); Giuseppe Nuzzo, *La Politica Estera della Monarchia Napoletana alla Fine del Secolo XVIII.* (*ibid.,* July 16); Domenico Spadoni, *La Conversione Italiana del Murat* (N. Riv. Stor., May); Albert Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie, l'Oeuvre Financière,* I. (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., XLIV. 3); Francesco Tommasini, *Il Centenario di Francesco Giuseppe* (N. Antol., Sept. 1); Oscar Albert Johnsen, *Les Relations Commerciales entre la Norvège et l'Espagne dans les Temps Modernes* (Rev. Hist., Sept.).

NORTHERN EUROPE

The *Journal of Modern History* for September contains a useful list of books on Scandinavian history published in the last three years. With a few important exceptions the writings listed deal with Swedish subjects.

In 1925 Einar Belsheim began to publish the results of his studies in racial contacts in northern and northwestern Europe from the beginning of our era to about 1050 A.D. The work is entitled *Norge og Vesteuropa i Gammel Tid* [Norway and Western Europe in Olden Days] and thus far has appeared in seven parts of some sixty pages each. The second division of the work deals with the foreign names that appear in Old Norse literature. The part most recently published (Oslo) carries this discussion into the letter G.

The leading article in the current yearbook of the Northern Antiquarian Society (*Aarböger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed,* 1929) is an elaborate study by Hans Brix of the magical values and properties once ascribed to the Runic alphabet (Nye Studier i Nordisk Runemagi).

Saint Anschaire by É. de Moreau, S.J. (Louvain, pp. xiii, 159), is an attempt to bring together what information we have as to the life and activities of the Apostle of the North. The millennial anniversary of St. Ansgar's preaching in Sweden was celebrated at Birca near Stockholm in 1929, and Father Moreau's book is in a sense a contribution to this celebration. Not much is known about St. Ansgar's work in Denmark and Sweden but his career as the first archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen can be studied with greater confidence. Father Moreau has included a sketch

of the early history of this foundation and discusses its importance as the metropolitan see of the Northern Church.

Edvard Bull's article in *Historisk Tidskrift* (1930, 2) on Kong Olav Haraldsson is a critical discussion of the sources, on which writers on early Norwegian history have largely depended in the past, and of some of the problems of St. Olaf's career which modern research has been able to bring into a somewhat clearer light.

Volume VIII. of L. Laursen's great work on the treaties of Denmark-Norway covers the years 1683–1689 (*Danmark-Norges Traktater, 1523–1750*, VIII., Copenhagen, pp. 675).

For some years Professor Oscar Albert Johnsen of the University of Oslo has been exploring the archives of France and the neighboring lands in a search for documents illustrating the history of Denmark and Norway, especially in their commercial relations. A part of his gleanings was published a year ago by the Norwegian Academy of Science under the title *Franske Arkivstudier* (Oslo, 1929).

Dr. Johannes Paul of the University of Greifswald, who some years ago published a volume on the reign of Gustavus Adolphus before the Thirty Years' War, has recently published a second volume dealing with Swedish intervention in this war and closing with the battle of Breitenfeld (*Gustaf Adolf*, II., Leipzig).

In a recent yearbook of the Caroline Society (*Karolinska Förbundets Årbok*, 1929), Per Sörensson continues his study of North European diplomacy in the years following the return of Charles XII. from Turkey (*Kejsaren, Sverige, och de Nordiska Allierade*). The article closes with the alliance entered into at Vienna (1719) by Charles VI., George I., and Augustus the Strong. The volume also contains other important studies in Swedish history in the earlier decades of the eighteenth century.

The Norwegian Historical Society has begun the publication in its review (*Historisk Tidsskrift*, 1930, 3) of a very important work in the parliamentary memoirs of Ludvig Daae, who was a member of the Norwegian parliament almost continuously from 1859 to 1888. The memoirs are based on a diary which the author edited later in life and contain much intimate information as to the political, social, and literary conditions in Norway during the second half of the nineteenth century.

A brief manual of Finnish history has been published in French by Jean Louis Perret, professor at the University of Helsingfors (*La Finlande*, Paris, pp. 148).

Karl Völker, *Kirchengeschichte Polens* (W. de Gruyter, Berlin and Leipzig, pp. 337), is the first complete exposition of Polish Church history of high scientific value.

Vol. II. of Karl Stählin's *Geschichte Russlands von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* has recently appeared. It deals with the period from Peter

the Great to the end of Catherine II.'s reign (Berlin, Ost-Europa-Verlag, pp. xii, 752). Vol. I., published originally by the Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt of Stuttgart, has been taken over by the Ost-Europa-Verlag.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Jörgen Bukdahl, *St. Olav and Norway* (Am. Scand. Rev., 7); Waldemar Carlsson, *Stralsund och Kejsaren*, 1636–37 (Hist. Tidsk., Swedish, 2); Asgaut Steinnes, *Gamal Myntrekning endå ein Gonug* (Hist. Tidssk., Norwegian, 1929, 4); Halvdan Koht, *Les Répercussions de la Conquête de l'Algérie sur la Politique Scandinave* (Rev. Hist., July); P. Dahlgren, *Om Sjöförbindelserna emellom Östersjön och Nordsjön under Vikingetiden* [Communications by Sea between the Baltic and the North Sea Areas in the Viking Age] (Nord. Tidsk., 1); N. Brian Chaninov, *Les Sources de l'Histoire de Russie* (Mercure de Fr., Aug. 15).

L. M. L.

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

The Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress has made the following acquisitions: papers of the Campbell and Preston families of southwestern Virginia (Arthur Campbell, William Campbell, William Campbell Preston, etc.), 1744–1845, about 1500 pieces; photostats of letters and documents of Franklin, Gerry, and Abraham Lincoln, and of some 300 letters of George Washington; copies of documents respecting John Paul Jones, four volumes; correspondence of Citizen Roume in Santo Domingo and the United States, 1798–1802; the log of the sloop *Hero*, Antarctic, 1820–1821; letters of Richard Armstrong and his wife, missionaries in the Hawaiian Islands, 1831–1854; papers of Rear Admiral John A. B. Dahlgren, 1826–1874, more than 5000 pieces; of General Benjamin F. Butler, about 50,000 pieces; of Senator John C. Spooner, 14 boxes; and of Secretary Walter Q. Gresham, about 1000 pieces.

The Library of Congress, which has long been the national repository for historical papers, proposes to undertake the preservation through photographic negatives of a record of our ancestral architecture, especially of such examples as are doomed to disappear. The proposed collection will consist of negatives, complete folio files of prints from these negatives, and very full indexes to facilitate the study of any phase of the subject. The cataloguing of the gifts of negatives already received is being done through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. Others which may be received will also be carefully indexed and the names of photographer and donor recorded. The Division of Fine Arts desires also to learn of private collections for the purpose of a record.

The first fascicle of volume XXII. of the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* is, like the preceding number, devoted chiefly to studies of the Indians and Esquimaux. The study on the Magiciens Esquimaux, by William Thalbitzer, is abundantly illustrated. This number also contains

a sketch of the distinguished ethnographer, Karl von den Steinen, who died a year ago. A bibliography of his writings is appended.

The student of American artistic taste will find much information in Thomas Hamilton Ormsbee's *Early American Furniture Makers* (New York, Crowell, pp. 183, plates lxvii, $3.50). Its theme is emphasized by the subtitle *A Social and Biographical Study*. One of the first furniture makers listed by the author is John Alden, but none of his pieces can be identified. A rather long list of makers called "American Chippendales" includes such names as William Savery, John Goddard and his Townsend kinsmen, and Colonel Marinus Willett. A chapter is devoted to Duncan Phyfe, the Great, and another to his contemporaries. The plates are excellent and possessors of family heirlooms will scan them with curiosity.

To the series edited by Professor Charles E. Merriam, on the characteristic elements of civic education as practiced by modern nations, belongs *Civic Attitudes in American School Textbooks*, by Bessie L. Pierce (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, pp. xiii, 297, $3.00). The author has examined about 400 textbooks in order to determine their attitude upon the conduct of nations especially involved in our history, chiefly, Spain, England, France, Germany, and Russia. It is obvious that many of these texts have been influenced either by the controversies which preceded the World War or by the emotions provoked by that struggle. Even when new editions have been issued since 1918 the war attitude has not been fundamentally changed. The chapter which will be examined with much interest is Germany in American History Textbooks. Another equally illuminating is The Foreign Policy of the United States. The importance of such a study is obvious when we recall that the influence of the textbook statement is commonly greater than that of direct instruction given by the teacher.

The Growth of the American Republic, by Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager (New York, Oxford University Press, pp. 956, $6.00), is designed for college use. It follows closely in structure and substance Professor Morison's well-known *Oxford History of the United States* published three years ago. Several preliminary chapters have been added to deal with the Revolutionary War and its causes. The authors rightly feel that the "college student should be addressed as a man rather than as a boy". This volume also addresses him as a man capable of appreciating a treatment of American history which shows breadth of conception and is presented in a genial style.

Dr. George D. Lyman, the author of *John Marsh, Pioneer* (New York, Scribners, pp. xii, 394, $3.50), has collected with unwearied zeal from a hundred sources the facts about what must have been a somewhat elusive figure. He has produced a story which illustrates many phases of frontier life, for his hero was, as the subtitle indicates, a *Trailblazer on Six Frontiers*. But he has not proved that Marsh was "one of the greatest

of our early adventurers" or that "his name should be a household word". Chapter XXII., the betrayal of the Foxes to the Sioux, with the terrible butchery that resulted, would be enough to deprive Marsh of such an honor were there not many other items in his record that are unpleasant stuff to makes heroes of.

Glimpses of the operation of our national legislative mechanism may be gained from ex-Senator George Wharton Pepper's *In the Senate* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 148, $2.00). Parts of the volume have appeared in current periodicals. The chapter headings provoke the reader's curiosity: for example, the White House from Capitol Hill, the Filibuster, and Losing the Job.

To construct a full-length portrait of a minor Revolutionary character who owes his fame to a single incident, or rather to the description of it by a beloved American poet, is the task undertaken by Emerson Taylor in *Paul Revere* (New York, Edward Valentine Mitchell and Dodd, Mead, pp. 237, $3.50). He has drawn his account from good sources, letters, official documents, and business records. It is a question whether he is correct in styling Revere a "mechanic". If one remembers the position of goldsmiths in Boston from John Hull down, the term seems misplaced. It is true that the author also describes him, and more exactly, as an artist of remarkable talents. The illustrations picturing four pieces preserved in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts show what an artist Revere was.

Professor Lester B. Shippee has revised and rewritten his *Recent American History* (New York, Macmillan, pp. xi, 590, $3.90), bringing the narrative down to the spring of 1930; faults and mistakes in the first edition have been corrected. As it stands the volume is a thoroughly competent treatment of its period. T. C. P.

In Professor James C. Malin's *The United States after the World War*, a textbook for college classes (Boston, Ginn, pp. iv, 584, $3.40), foreign relations are put in the foreground, for part I. deals with the United States and the Establishment of International Government. Further discussion of American foreign policy is deferred to part III., part II. treating Domestic Policies after the World War. There is also a fourth part, of two chapters, describing Political Parties and Policies and presenting Factors in recent American History: an Interpretation. The treatment illustrates the present trend in college instruction away from narrative and to the discussion of problems.

At the second annual Institute of Pan American Relations held on October 10–13 at MacMurry College, Jacksonville, Ill., both Professor Dexter Perkins and Professor W. S. Robertson expressed the thought that the Monroe Doctrine should be redefined. They felt that it should not be used as a cloak for everything done in the Caribbean and that its utilization for such purposes hindered coöperation between the United States and Hispanic America. Professor W. W. Sweet emphasized the

contribution made by South America to art and literature. Mr. Chester D. Pugsley, the chairman, whose generosity supports the Institute, announced that a third annual session would be held in October of 1931.

Articles: L. C. Karpinski, *The First Map with the Name America* (Geo. Rev., Oct.); Therkel Mathiassen, *An Old Eskimo Culture in West Greenland* (*ibid.*, Oct.); Alwin Paul, *Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, seine Leistung für die Vereinigten Staaten* (Eur. Gespr., Oct.); W. E. Dodd, *Tom Paine* (Amer. Mer., Dec.); Ada McLeod, *Some Loyalists of Prince Edward Island*, (Dalhousie Rev., Oct.); W. F. Galpin, *Early Peace Efforts in Rhode Island* (Adv. of Peace, Aug.); Annie V. Mann, *The Supreme Court of the Confederate States: Why was one never Organized?* (Confed. Vet., Nov.); William M. Robinson, jr., *The Confederate Engineers* (The Mil. Engineer, July to Dec.); W. J. Eiteman, *The Rise and Decline of Tariff Propaganda* (Quar. Jour. of Ec., Nov.); R. L. Parker, *Governor N. P. St. John, Nemesis of J. G. Blaine* (The Aerend, Fall); Lieutenant Thomas North, *Historical Parallels* (Field Artillery Jour., Nov.).

ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The discerning reader who takes up the *New England Quarterly* for October will turn first to James Truslow Adams's review of Professor Morison's *Builders of the Bay Colony*. In this volume Professor Morison incidentally attacks certain interpretations of New England Puritanism which Mr. Adams has given in his own writings, and he sent the volume to Mr. Adams for review. The criticism and rejoinder make clear the points at issue. The first article in this number, by Ralph G. Lounsbury, offers more interesting evidence of the sharp, but easily explicable, practices of the New England merchants in the colonial period. Its title is Yankee Trade at Newfoundland. Bertha Monica Stearns describes New England Magazines for Ladies. In another article, Francis Dana: an Early Envoy of Trade, W. P. Cresson shows how Dana tried as minister at the Court of Catherine II. to develop trade with Russia.

It was inevitable in the centenary year that the birthplaces of New England should become almost as numerous as those of Homer. This may account for the subtitle of the volume on *Monhegan, the Cradle of New England*, by Ida Sedgwick Proper (Portland, Southworth Press, pp. 275). The author has diligently ransacked every early record to define the rôle of this picturesque island, with a tendency to use "undoubtedly" and "must have been" where evidence is scanty. The interest of her story is enhanced by abundant quotations from documents and other records.

Mr. Robert Fitzgibbon Young in an essay entitled *Comenius and the Indians of New England* (London, School of Slavonic Studies, 1929, pp.

27, 3 s.) discusses the tradition that the famous Moravian educational reformer was invited by the younger Winthrop to become president of Harvard College, pointing out the improbabilities of the story. His main purpose is to show the interest Comenius took in the education of the Indians carried on by Eliot with the aid of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. He finds evidence of the use of the *Janua Aurea Linguarum* as a textbook in the higher schools of New England.

The *Journal of Abijah Willard of Lancaster, Massachusetts* (pp. 75, maps), an officer in the expedition which captured Fort Beauséjour in 1755, edited by J. Clarence Webster, has been reprinted from the *Collections* of the New Brunswick Historical Society, no. 13.

The *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* has in the October number an article by Louis A. Warren on Lincoln's Pioneer Father, and prints the Journal of Dr. Daniel Shute, surgeon in the Revolution, 1781–1782.

In the *Proceedings* of the Vermont Historical Society, new series, vol. I., no. 3, is printed a History of Irasburgh to 1856, by an unidentified author, being the story of the town which Ira Allen presented to his wife as a marriage settlement. In the same issue is an address by John Spargo on Berkshire County Men at Bennington Battle.

Volume III. of the *History of Woodstock* (Genealogies of Woodstock Families), by Clarence W. Bowen, Ph.D., LL.D., was published in November.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The October number of the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* contains a genealogical account of the Van Zandt family of New York City, compiled by H. S. F. Randolph, and the Federal Census of 1800 for Rockland County, New York.

Volume XXX. of the *Publications* of the Buffalo Historical Society is made up chiefly of the reports and addresses read at the "Dedication of the Historical Building as Enlarged". It is illustrated with well-executed photographs of the building and its equipment, as well as of the members composing the Board of Managers.

The initial item in the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society for October is the address of President Hoover at Gettysburg on May 30, which the editor of the *Proceedings* believes destined to become a great American classic. Other articles describe Lands in the New Jersey Angle, written by Dr. Oscar M. Voorhees; the American Dickens [Theodore Winthrop], by William S. Hunt; New Stockholm, the Swedish Settlement, by Samuel H. Richards. There is a group of letters respecting New Jersey in 1681, and another group for the years 1777–1778, the letters of Cornelia Bell, afterward the wife of William Paterson, to her brother.

The *Bulletin* of the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, vol. XII., no. 15 (Nov. 1, 1929), is a monograph on *Agriculture in Pennsylvania: a Study of Trends, County and State, since 1840,* by George Fiske Johnson. There is a brief introduction on the Colonial period.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains the following articles: R. L. Brunhouse, the Effect of the Townshend Acts in Pennsylvania; James H. Peeling, Governor McKean and the Pennsylvania Jacobins, 1799–1808; Charles P. Keith, the Founding of Christ Church, Philadelphia; and a companion article, by Horace W. Sellers, on the Architectural Spirit of Christ Church.

The *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, for June, concludes the Note Book of the Venerable Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann. The leading article is on the Redemptorists in America, which is to be continued. Mr. Clarence E. Martin contributes an essay on the Legal Aspect of the English Penal Laws.

Through the generosity of the Buhl Foundation of Pittsburgh the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania and the department of history of the University of Pittsburgh are able to carry forward a vigorous program of research and writing in the history of the Pittsburgh district. The project is to be under the general guidance of a curator, who is also to be appointed to a professorship in the University of Pittsburgh. There will be two assistants of the rank of university instructors and three fellows. The amount set aside by the Buhl Foundation is $70,000 for a period of five years. Other amounts are to be added by the Historical Society and the University of Pittsburgh, the total being $105,000.

The principal contents of the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: Captain Samuel A. Craig's Memoirs of Civil War and Reconstruction; a Half-Century of Rivalry between Pittsburgh and Wheeling, by F. Frank Crall; and Problems of Trade in Early Western Pennsylvania, by Randolph C. Downes.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The first article in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for October, by Professor J. G. Randall, deals with Lincoln's Task and Wilson's, and makes interesting comparisons between the characteristic methods of the two in meeting great crises. Incidentally he points out the differing reactions of Lincoln and Wilson to opposition and criticism. Among other articles are: Clemenceau, Chronicler of American Politics, by Howard J. Pearce, jr., a description of a recent publication of letters on *American Reconstruction, 1865–1870,* written while Clemenceau resided in this country; Art in the Early South, by Mary H. Flournoy; and a discussion of the significance of the approaching Bolivar Centenary, by J. Fred Rippy.

The September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* includes an article on Education and the Maryland Constitutional Convention, 1864,

by L. E. Blauch; and Baltimore County Records of 1668 and 1669, contributed by Louis D. Scisco.

The article of chief general interest in the *Bulletin* of the Friends' Historical Association, autumn number, is the Life and Travels of a Southern Quaker Minister, by Norman Penney, LL.D. The Quaker minister was Charity (Wright) Cook (1745–1822), of Maryland.

In the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* Major Edgar E. Hume's contribution, A Colonial Scottish Jacobite Family, is continued, as is also the series of letters of the Byrd family. In the section of Notes and Queries is printed the will of Bishop James Madison of Virginia, January 8, 1812, contributed by Professor E. M. Violette of the University of Louisiana.

Major Edgar E. Hume contributes to the October number of *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine*, with notes and comment, a series of letters written during the War of 1812 by Admiral Sir David Milne, British naval commander in American waters; Arthur G. Peterson an article on Commerce in Virginia, 1789–1791; and Miss Sarah Robertson, of Amherst, Virginia, some letters of Virginians in Indiana, 1835, 1839. An item of unusual interest in this number is a group of five speeches delivered by students of William and Mary College before the governor, council, members of the House of Burgesses, and others, on May 1, 1699.

The principal content of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for October is a continuation of the series of letters published under the general title the Old Virginia Line in the Middle States during the American Revolution. The letters in this issue extend from August, 1776, to September, 1778, and occupy more than fifty pages of the *Magazine*. An editorial contribution, entitled After Sixty-Five Years, discusses the results of emancipation.

To the increasing literature of the history of legal administration Professor G. R. Sherrill has added a volume entitled *Criminal Procedure in North Carolina, as shown by Criminal Appeals since 1890* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, pp. x, 173, $3.00).

The chief new accessions of manuscript material of the North Carolina Historical Commission are: the diary of Dr. J. E. Green, second lieutenant, company I., 53d North Carolina regiment, C. S. A.; correspondence of governors D. S. Reid (11 letters); E. B. Dudley (65 letters); J. M. Morehead (78 letters); and Gabriel Holmes (46 letters).

In the October number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* appear an article by C. C. Crittenden on the Seacoast in North Carolina History, 1763–1789; another by Charles P. Loomis on Activities of the North Carolina Farmers' Union [activities of social and educational as well as economic and political significance in the decade following 1908]; and an account by John S. Kendall of Historical Collections in New

Orleans. Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, George McDuffie, and Charles Fisher, relating to the presidential campaign of 1824, selected from the Fisher Manuscripts in the library of the University of North Carolina, is contributed, with much helpful annotation, by A. R. Newsome. In the section of Historical Notes are three essays on proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution.

A pamphlet recording the *Ceremonies attending the Presentation and Unveiling of the North Carolina Memorial on the Battlefield of Gettysburg, Wednesday, July 3d, 1929* (pp. 44), has appeared, without imprint, but presumably issued by the North Carolina Historical Commission.

The contents of the October number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* are chiefly continuations. The letters of Peter Manigault, edited by Mabel L. Webber, are of the years 1750–1751; those in the Garth correspondence of the years 1770–1771. Robert F. Seybolt contributes some notices of South Carolina Schoolmasters of 1744.

A *Catalogue of the Wymberley Jones De Renne Georgia Library*, at Wormsloe, Isle of Hope, near Savannah, Georgia, in three volumes, 1700–1929 (Wormsloe, privately printed), has been published by the children of Mr. De Renne as a memorial to him. The cataloguing is, in the main, the work of Mr. William Price, under the general direction of Leonard L. Mackall.

The *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* has in the October number an article by V. M. Scramuzza on Galveztown: a Spanish Settlement of Colonial Louisiana, and presents a photostatic reproduction, from the *Gentleman's Magazine* (Oct., 1763), of the British proclamation of October 7, 1763, creating the government of West Florida, with an introduction by Henry P. Dart. James K. Greer's study of Louisiana Politics, 1845–1861, is concluded.

The *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, October number, contains an Historical Note on Dimmit County, Texas, by Paul S. Taylor; Notes on Commercial Relations between New Orleans and Texan Ports, 1838–1839, by James E. Winston; the Diary of H. C. Meford, Confederate Soldier, 1864, edited by Rebecca W. Smith and Marion Mullins; and the second installment of William A. McClintock's Journal of a Trip through Texas and Northern Mexico in 1846–1847.

WESTERN STATES

The December number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* is the first to appear under the editorship of Professor Arthur C. Cole, of Western Reserve University. The articles are: John Stuart's Indian Policy during the early Months of the American Revolution, by Philip M. Hamer; Louisiana as a Factor in French Diplomacy from 1763 to 1800, by Mildred S. Fletcher; the United States Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860, by George D. Harmon; Hugh McCulloch and the Treasury Depart-

ment, 1865–1869, by Herbert S. Schell; the Gold Standard Democrats and the Party Conflict, by James A. Barnes.

The October number of *Mid-America* contains an article, by Marion A. Habig, on Father Gabriel de la Ribourde, O.F.M., the First Martyr in Illinois, who, however, appears in the table of contents as "John"; and another by Paul J. Foik on Fray Juan de Padilla; and the Journal of Charles Galpin, interpreter, who accompanied Father De Smet on his Sioux peace mission in 1868. Gilbert J. Garraghan contributes an introduction to the Journal.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society for October contains the first part of a study by George L. Willis, sr., of the History of Kentucky Constitutions and Constitutional Conventions, and an article by Ellery L. Hall on Canadian Annexation Sentiment in Kentucky prior to the War of 1812.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Filson Club History Quarterly* are: Three Kentucky Pioneers: James, Patrick, and William Brown, by William A. Pusey; and Silk Culture in Henderson County, Kentucky, by Spalding Trafton. Mr. Otto A. Rothert contributes a short history of the Filson Club, together with a bibliography of its publications.

Mr. R. C. Ballard Thruston, president of the Filson Club, Louisville, Kentucky, would appreciate any information regarding the original editions of Filson's history and map of Kentucky published in 1784 or the names and addresses of persons possessing either. Most of the maps that have been located were printed on laid paper bearing a watermark "P P D" and "Work & Be Rich" surmounted by a plow. He especially desires information as to when, where, and by whom that paper was made.

The *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, after much regretful lagging in its appearance and ultimate suspension, has resumed publication (with courage and with hope), inaugurating a second series, of which the October number is the first. The initial article is on Joseph McMinn, Governor of Tennessee, 1815–1821: the Man and his Times, by Edwin M. Murphey, jr. Another of the articles is Andrew Jackson and the Burr Conspiracy, by James B. Ranck; still another is an Ohio Farmer in Middle Tennessee in 1865, by R. Pierce Beaver.

The Committee on Coöperation representing the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, the local historical societies of the state, and the colleges and universities met Saturday, November 1, and approved a plan presented by Secretary C. B. Galbreath for the immediate publication of the first volume of a regular series of historical collections relating to the history of Ohio. An editorial committee was appointed consisting of Mr. Galbreath, Dr. Carl Wittke, and Dr. W. T. Utter.

The *Quarterly Bulletin* of the Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio prints in the October number a selection from the Canadian archives

of reports and correspondence respecting the War of 1812. Some of these documents pertain to Hull's surrender of Detroit, others to the first and second sieges of Fort Meigs, others to Perry's victory and to the battle of the Thames. The principal items are reports of Major General Henry Proctor, British commander.

The Historical Bureau of the Indiana State Library and Historical Department plans to publish during the year a volume of maps showing the development of the state and county boundaries of Indiana since the Ordinance of 1787. This compilation will appear as volume XVIII. of the *Indiana Historical Collections.*

The Indiana Historical Society, of which Professor James A. Woodburn is president, celebrated the centennial of its organization on December 11, 12, and 13. Professor Evarts B. Greene, president of the American Historical Association, was one of the speakers, making an address on the theme of Our Pioneer Historical Societies.

Miss Dorothy Riker of the Indiana State Historical Bureau has prepared a 200-page index of volumes I. to XXV. of the *Indiana Magazine of History* which has been published and is now for sale by the *Magazine* at Indiana University. The *Magazine* was first published under the name of the *Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History* at Indianapolis under the editorship of George S. Cottman. He was editor from 1905 to 1908 and from 1911 to 1913. From 1908 to 1911, Christopher B. Coleman was editor. Since 1913 it has been published as the *Indiana Magazine of History* by Indiana University.

The September number of the *Indiana History Bulletin* is an illustrated monograph on *The Archaeology of the Whitewater Valley* (pp. 549), by Frank M. Setzler. The October number contains the usual chronicle of anniversaries, centennials, and activities of local historical societies.

The September number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains a biography of Amos Lane, Advocate of Western Democracy, by Wendell H. Stephenson. The story is that of a stormy petrel in state politics who eventually found his way to Congress for two terms (1833–1837), "assertive, contentious, provocative, vindictive", yet evincing on occasion "a dignity of manner, a serenity of spirit, and an honesty of purpose that were admirable".

The *Transactions* of the Illinois State Historical Society for the year 1929 (*Publication,* no. 36, of the Illinois State Historical Library) contains, besides the record of official proceedings, etc., a number of historical studies. Those of more general interest are: the address of President Albert Britt: Truth Telling, a Difficult and Dangerous Art; Indian Diplomacy during the Revolution in the West, by Louise Phelps Kellogg; the Lincoln of the Biographers, by William E. Barton; Values in the Mid-Century Literature of the Middle West, by Arthur H. Hirsch; the Stormy Years of the Swedish Colony in Chicago before the Great Fire.

by George M. Stephenson; and the Life of Shadrach Bond, the First Governor of Illinois under Statehood, by Kinnie A. Ostewig.

The contents of the July number of the *Journal* of the Illinois State Historical Society are in large part documentary, including the Civil War Letters of Brigadier General William Ward Orme, 1862–1866, and the Diary of Mrs. Caroline Phelps, 1830–1840.

Among the contents of the October number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are: a first article, by Walter B. Stevens, on the late Joseph B. McCullagh, managing editor of the *Globe-Democrat*; an account, by A. P. Nasatir, of the Formation of the Missouri Company ("Company of the Explorers of the Upper Missouri", organized in 1794, though it had its beginnings in 1793); Opening the Santa Fé Trail, by I. J. Cox; and a History of Woman Suffrage in Missouri, 1867–1901, by Monia Cook Morris.

Henry Ormal Severance, librarian of the University of Missouri, in *Michigan Trailmakers* (Ann Arbor, George Wahr, pp. 164, $1.35) has told the story of several pioneers of Oakland County, drawing not only upon the records preserved by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, but also upon the recollections of persons still living. It is not a tale of frontier adventure, except the adventure of turning the wilderness into fruitful farms. The period described is chiefly that of the 'thirties and 'forties of the past century.

The principal article in the autumn number of *Michigan History Magazine* is Reminiscences of Detroit, by Rev. James F. Dickie. Among the lesser articles is a discourse upon Our Public Schools Yesterday and Today, by J. H. Rockwell. This number of the *Magazine* contains also some early views of the campus of the University of Michigan, contributed by Wilfred B. Shaw.

The subject of the *Burton Historical Leaflet* for September is the Chêne Family in Detroit, by Louise Rau. In the November number Dr. M. M. Quaife describes A Boy of Old Detroit.

An account of the career of Daniel Harris Smith (1808–1893), noted river steamboat captain, by William J. Petersen, is the principal article in the October number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*. The Journal and Letters (1862–1863) of Corporal William O. Gulick, edited by M. H. Guyer, are concluded.

The October number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an article on Buffalo in Iowa, by L. H. Pammel, and one on Abandoned Towns of Iowa, by David C. Mott.

Nearly half the pages of the September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* are occupied by chapter I. of the Memoirs of Mary D. Bradford, principally a narrative of pioneer experiences. The same number contains some Memoirs of the Mexican War, by General Charles

S. Hamilton, the first installment of Observations on the Menominee Indians, by W. H. Titus, and an article by Elizabeth Jenkins, How the Kindergarten Came to America.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has recently received 550 letters which were assembled by the late Cadwallader Colden Washburn, one time governor of Wisconsin. The collection covers the period from 1844 to 1879. Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the society, has brought together, from all of the collections in the upper Mississippi Valley, data relating to manuscript California diaries and letters from which he is preparing a bibliography of such material to be published as an appendix to the *California Letters of Lucius Fairchild,* edited by him, which is now in press.

The third volume of the Wisconsin Domesday Book, general series, entitled *Wisconsin's Lead Region* is now ready for the press. This volume deals with the three southwestern counties of Wisconsin which were most prominent in the history of lead and zinc mining.

The September number of *Minnesota History* contains two historical articles: the Beginning of British Trade at Michilimackinac, by Marjorie G. Jackson, and Early Milling in the Cannon River Valley, by Paul R. Fossum.

In the September number of the *Colorado Magazine,* Rufus Phillips describes Early Cowboy Life in the Arkansas Valley. In the November number, C. S. Thomas tells the story of an Argonaut of the Roaring Fork, and Robert H. Bahmer writes of the Colorado Gold Rush and California. The Religious Side of Pioneering in Routt County is described in an article written in 1906 by E. Shelton, one of the early settlers of the region.

The April issue of the *North Dakota Historical Quarterly* contains a paper by Russell Reid on the Earth Lodge, and some Civil War letters of E. H. Frank, member of company A, 26th regiment of Iowa infantry, volunteers. The July number has an article on Arikara Ceremonials, by George F. Will, and a group of Civil War letters of John Adams. The principal article in the October number is an account, by C. C. Qualey, of Pioneer Norwegian Settlement in North Dakota. Another article describes the relations between John Jacob Astor and Lord Selkirk, by Kenneth W. Porter.

The *Chronicles of Oklahoma,* September number, contains a History of the Cherokee Indians, by Hugh T. Cunningham; an article on the Organization of Counties in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, by Muriel H. Wright; an account, by Dan W. Peery, of the White Kiowa Captive (Tahan), and an account, by Tahan, of the Battle of Washita (November, 1868).

The principal contents of the October number of the *New Mexico Historical Review* are continuations of the Bandelier Documentary History of

the Rio Grande Pueblos, and the history, by France V. Scholes, of the Supply Service of the New Mexican Missions in the Seventeenth Century.

The *Oregon Historical Quarterly* has in the September number an article by Kenneth W. Porter on the Cruise of Astor's Brig, *Pedler*, 1813–1816; the Pioneer Narrative of Asa Lawrence Lovejoy, 1842–1848, with introduction and notes by Henry E. Reed; and the concluding installments of the Pioneer Narrative of James D. Miller and the study of Indian Slavery in the Pacific Northwest, by Elsie F. Dennis.

The principal article in the October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly*, other than continuations hitherto mentioned, is one on the Maritime Activities of the Northwest Company, 1813–1821, by Marion O'Neill. F. W. Howay contributes Some Notes on Cook's and Vancouver's Ships, 1776–1780, 1791–1795.

Dr. Henry G. Restarick, president of the Hawaiian Historical Society, in an essay on The Discovery of Hawaii, contends that Gaetano did not discover Hawaii and that the Spaniards did not know of the existence of the Hawaiian Islands before Captain James Cook's visit.

MEXICO, CUBA, AND SOUTH AMERICA

In the *Hispanic American Historical Review* for November the first article, by Percy A. Martin, is a sketch of the career of José Batlle y Ordóñez, the contemporary Uruguayan statesman. An article by John T. Lanning describes the attitude of England toward Spanish recognition of the Hispanic American nations. The notes contain an article by Cecil Jane concerning the literacy of Columbus in 1492. The bibliographical section prints a note by Roscoe R. Hill concerning reforms in the Archivo General de Indias, as well as a trial bibliography of Simón Bolívar compiled by the Pan American Union.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art has published a volume on *Peruvian Textiles, Examples of the Pre-Incaic Period*, with a chronology of early Peruvian cultures by Philip Ainsworth Means and an introduction by Joseph Breck. There are twenty-four beautifully executed plates.

The Academia de la Historia de Cuba has published an address by Dr. José Rodríguez García entitled *De la Revolución y de las Cubanas en la Época Revolucionaria*, and also a *Historia Documentada de San Cristóbal de la Habana en las Primera Mitad del Siglo XVII.*, by Irene A. Wright.

No. 50 of the *Boletín* de la Academia Nacional de la Historia of Venezuela is commemorative of the centenary of the death of General Antonio José de Sucre, the victor at the Battle of Ayacucho. It contains, besides accounts of commemorative services, the following items: inedited letters of Sucre, an account of his papers in the library of Yale University, an article by Vicente Lecuna on the Battle of Ayacucho, one by Luis A. Sucre on the lineage of Bolívar and Sucre, and another on the remains of Sucre by Manuel Segundo Sánchez.

Nos. 40 and 41 of the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* of Venezuela contain installments of indexes of documents in those archives pertaining to encomiendas, illustrious leaders in the South American revolution, the consulate of Caracas, and the papers of Dr. Julian Viso.

Vol. II. of *Nuevos Documentos Inéditos ó Muy Raros para la Historia de México*, edited by Carlos E. Castañeda of the University of Texas, is a *Historia de Todos los Colegios de la Ciudad de México desde la Conquista hasta 1780 por el Dr. Félix de Osores.* Vol. III. of the same series is *La Guerra de Reforma, según el Archivo del Gral. D. Manuel Doblado, 1857–1860.*

The New York Public Library has published in facsimile *The Conquest of Peru, as recorded by a Member of the Pizarro Expedition,* reproduced from the copy of the Seville edition of 1534 in the New York Public Library, with a translation and annotations by Joseph H. Sinclair (New York, 1929), and accompanied by a brief bibliography. Vol. LIV., no. 8, of the *Proceedings* of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences contains The Anonymous *La Conquista del Peru* (Seville, April, 1534), mentioned above, as well as the *Libro Ultimo del Summario delle Indice Occidentali* (Venice, October, 1534), edited with an introduction and bibliography by Alexander Pogo.

Dr. José R. Wendelbake has published *The Master of Bolivar* (Colon, 1930).

To commemorate the centenary of the death of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar, December 17, 1830, the government of Venezuela has just published the *Cartas del Libertador* in ten volumes (Caracas, Lit. y Tip. del Comercio, 1929–1930). This collection of private correspondence has been gathered with great pains from diverse sources and collated by Vicente Lecuna.

W. S. R.

Contributions to the section of Historical News have been made by G. C. Boyce, T. R. S. Broughton, Edmund C. Burnett, Eugene N. Curtis, J. F. Jameson, L. M. Larson, D. C. Munro, T. C. Pease, and W. S. Robertson.

To the Editor of the *American Historical Review*:

May I take the space of your columns to make the following corrections in my article, Chinese Historical Studies during the Past Nine Years, which have been brought to my attention:

Page 779, lines 20–21. *Hu Shih Wen Ts'un* and *Ya Tung T'u Shu Kuan* should read *Hu Shih Wen Ts'un* by the Ya Tung T'u Shu Kuan.

Page 782, footnote, line 6. For Nanking, read Shanghai.

Ibid., line 15. For *Min-teh*, read *Min-toh*.

Page 783, line 23. For Wei Yi-pao, read Mei Yi-pao.

K. S. Latourette.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1884 Chartered by Congress in 1889

Principal Office

40 B STREET, S. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

MEMBERSHIP
NOVEMBER, 1930

Life members, 533; annual members, 2806; institutions, 312; total, 3651. Persons interested in historical studies, whether professionally or otherwise, are invited to membership.

MEETINGS

Annual Meetings are held the last week in December in various cities. The program of papers presented and the business meeting occupy three days. Average attendance, about 500.

PUBLICATIONS

The *Annual Report,* covering the activities of the Association, and usually a supplementary volume of importance to students of history, is printed by virtue of an appropriation by Congress of $7000 each fiscal year, and is sent to members who request it.

The *American Historical Review,* published quarterly, is sent free to all members. A journal without any superior in the competent treatment of the entire field of Ancient, Medieval, and Modern history.

PRIZES

Justin Winsor Prize, of $200, is awarded for an essay in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

PRIZES—*Continued*

Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, of $200, is awarded for an essay in the history of the Eastern Hemisphere.

John H. Dunning Prize, of $200, is awarded for an essay on "any and all subjects relating to the political and social transformation of the Southern States since 1865, provided that said subjects have antecedents in, or are related to, conditions in those states prior to 1876".

George Louis Beer Prize, of $250, is awarded for the best work upon any phase of European international history since 1895.

Jean Jules Jusserand Medal is offered annually for the best work on intellectual relations between America and one or more European countries.

State and Local Historical Societies—The Association maintains close relations with the state and local historical societies through conferences in connection with the annual meetings.

Pacific Coast Branch—The Pacific Coast Branch holds meetings in November in various cities of the Pacific Coast. Full membership in the Association is maintained.

DUES

The annual dues are $5; there is no initiation fee. The fee for life membership, $100, secures exemption from all annual dues.

CORRESPONDENCE

Inquiries respecting the Association should be addressed to the Assistant Secretary at 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

HISTORY OF AM

1898

THE QUEST

Harold U

Professor Faulkner

der," turning from the

ing decades of the

bility and control.

"malleable rights"

the awakening of the

tion, labor, and feminist

the rights of children;

science; the leaders

Slosson shows us all

anced contribution to the

Cloth.

1914

THE GREAT CRU

Preston

Professor Slosson gives

our own scene and behavior

siduous in collecting historic

cautious in evaluating it

torian writing of

what the war

ans. To this end he

manifestations of the

before our eyes into

collegiate football, Coolidge

the A. E. F., prohibition,

ising, the harnessing of

key volume for this remarkable

College edition

Cloth.

Seven volumes of this

are available. If you

Americana

MACMILLAN